

STACK  
ANNEX

5

056

366

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PUBLICATIONS

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

Vol. 1, No. 7, pp. 205-262

June, 1907

D  
0  
0  
0  
0  
1  
5  
3  
0  
5  
6



UP SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY

SOME PHASES OF THE RELATION OF  
THOUGHT TO VERSE IN PLAUTUS

BY

HENRY W. PRESCOTT

BERKELEY

THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

## UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PUBLICATIONS

**Note.**—The University of California Publications are offered in exchange for the publications of learned societies and institutions, universities and libraries. Complete lists of all the publications of the University will be sent upon request. For sample copies, lists of publications or other information, address the **Manager of the University Press, Berkeley, California, U. S. A.** All matter sent in exchange should be addressed to **The Exchange Department, University Library, Berkeley, California, U. S. A.**

**CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY.**—Edward B. Clapp, William A. Merrill, Herbert C. Nutting, Editors. Price per volume \$2.00. Volume I (in progress).

No. 1.	Hiatus in Greek Melic Poetry, by Edward B. Clapp.	Price, \$0.50
No. 2.	Studies in the Si-clause, by Herbert C. Nutting.	“ .60
No. 3.	The Whence and Whither of the Modern Science of Language, by Benj. Ide Wheeler	“ .25
No. 4.	On the Influence of Lucretius on Horace, by William A. Merrill	“ .25
No. 5.	The Priests of Asklepios (A New Method of Dating Athenian Archons), by William Scott Ferguson	“ .50
No. 6.	Horace's Alcaic Strophe, by Leon Josiah Richardson	“ .25
No. 7.	Some Phases of the Relation of Thought to Verse in Plautus, by Henry W. Prescott	“ .50

The following series in Graeco-Roman Archaeology, Egyptian Archaeology, American Archaeology and Ethnology and Anthropological Memoirs are publications from the Department of Anthropology:

### GRAECO-ROMAN ARCHAEOLOGY. (Large Octavo).

Vol. 1.	The Tebtunis Papyri, Part 1. Edited by Bernard P. Grenfell, Arthur S. Hunt, and J. Gilbert Smyly. Pages 690, Plates 9, 1902	Price, \$16.00
Vol. 2.	The Tebtunis Papyri, Part 2 (in press).	
Vol. 3.	The Tebtunis Papyri, Part 3 (in preparation).	

### EGYPTIAN ARCHAEOLOGY. (Quarto).

Vol. 1.	The Hearst Medical Papyrus. Edited by G. A. Reisner. Hieratic text in 17 facsimile plates in collotype, with introduction and vocabulary. pages 48, 1905. (J. C. Hinrichs, Leipzig, 25 Marks)	Price, \$8.00
---------	---	---------------

### AMERICAN ARCHAEOLOGY AND ETHNOLOGY. (Octavo).

Vol. 1.	1903-1904. 378 pp., with 30 plates.	Price, \$4.25
Vol. 2.	1904-1907. 392 pp., with 21 plates and map.	Price, 3.50
Vol. 3.	The Morphology of the Hupa Language, by Pliny Earle Goddard. Pages 344, June, 1905.	Price, 3.50
Vol. 4.	No. 1. The Earliest Historical Relations between Mexico and Japan, by Zelia Nuttall. Pages 47, April, 1906.	Price, .50
	No. 2. Contributions to the Physical Anthropology of California, by A. Hrdlicka. Pages 16, Tables 5, Plates 10, June, 1906.	Price, .75
	No. 3. Shoshonean Dialects of California, by A. L. Kroeber. Pages 100, February, 1907.	Price, 1.50
	No. 4. Indian Myths of South Central California, by A. L. Kroeber. Pages 84, May 1907.	Price, .75
Vol. 5.	No. 1. The Phonology of the Hupa Language: Part I, The Individual Sounds, by Pliny Earle Goddard. Pages 20, Plates 8, March, 1907.	Price, .35
Vol. 6.	The Ethno-Geography of the Pomo Indians, by S. A. Barrett (in press).	
Vol. 7.	No. 1. The Emeryville Shellmound, by Max Uhle. Pages 106, Plates 12, June, 1907.	Price, 1.25



SOME PHASES OF THE RELATION OF  
THOUGHT TO VERSE IN PLAUTUS

BY

HENRY W. PRESCOTT.

In his study of the Saturnian verse Leo has recently stated his conception of the relation of thought to verse in early Latin poetry: "in early Latin verse," Leo says, with reference especially to the Saturnian, "verse and sentence are identical; art-poetry in its beginnings" (and he refers to Plautus as illustrative of the principle)," when sentence-structure was developing. resisted this inherent requirement and limited itself to the norm by which words in the sentence intimately connected in thought were not separated by the verse unless the separation was justified by special considerations: externally, by reason of length, or by the colligation of words through alliteration or other means of connection; internally, by reason of emphasis or some stylistic effect of the word thus separated."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "Vers und Satz fallen ursprünglich zusammen; . . . Die Kunstpoesie hat in ihren Anfängen, wie sich die Satzbildung mächtig entwickelte, mit dieser der Poesie innewohnenden Forderung gekämpft und sie auf die Norm beschränkt, dass im Satze eng zusammengehörige Wörter nicht durch den Vers getrennt werden dürfen, wenn sich nicht die Trennung durch einen besonderen Umstand als berechtigt erweist; äusserlich durch Länge, durch allitterierende oder andere einander suchende und anziehende Wortverbindungen, innerlich durch Nachdruck oder sonst stilistische Absicht des gesonderten Worts. So erscheint der Gebrauch bei Plautus ausgebildet." Der saturnische Vers 14 = Abhandl. Götting. Gesell. (1905).

In 1881 Bücheler reminded Schoell that only pronominal adjectives were separated from their nouns by the verse-end, that almost no other adjectives were so treated, in the text of Plautus (Truculentus, ed. Schoell, praefatio XLV, n. 1). Bücheler repeated this admonition in

Leo has left to others the task of testing the validity of his law. I have attempted to gather and study the evidence offered by one group of examples in Plautus, the cases in which adjectival words, whether ordinary attributives, pronominal adjectives, or numerals, are separated from their substantives by the verse. In many respects the study must be descriptive: the lack of similar studies in Greek poetry, and the fragmentary remains of earlier Latin poetry, usually of uncertain metrical constitution, retard a convincing account of Plautus's position in the historical development of verse-technique. Nor will it be just to confirm or refute Leo's theory until other phases of the problem in Plautus, and the corresponding phenomena in Greek poetry are investigated. For the present, the study may suggest points of view and methods of approach, which will doubtless need readjustment as the problem is studied in its larger aspects.

## I.

Among the features that Leo enumerates as justifying separation is length: this element may be a matter of syllables, or in addition to syllables may include an extension of thought. That is, a given word may be long, or a thought-unit involving several words may be long. In either case, it is not at once clear that length occasions the separation. If, however, as appears to be

---

Rh. Mus. 41 (1887) 312. In 1893 Appuhn published his dissertation: *Quaestiones Plautinae. Quae rationes inter versus singulos sententiasque intercedant Plauti exemplo comprobatur* (Marburg). Interpretative analysis was impossible in this attempt to cover a large field within the compass of a doctor's dissertation.

Norden summarizes the usage of Vergil in *Aeneis* Buch VI, 390-391. For references to studies of the general question of the collocation of words, as well as of the special question under consideration, cf. the same work 382 n. 1, and the same author's *Die antike Kunstprosa* I 68 n. 1.

In the present paper the song-measures are excluded; I have not knowingly included examples from such passages except for comparative purposes, and then their provenance is stated. I may be open to criticism in not dividing the material with reference to the metre of the verses concerned; but the results show no important differences between the technique of the iambic and trochaic verses, or of the shorter and longer verses, except such as may more conveniently be described parenthetically, and a metrical classification interferes with clearness of presentation.

the case,<sup>2</sup> words of five or more syllables that are metrically suitable regularly tend to the end of the verse, or less frequently to the beginning, it follows that, if such a word is a substantive or adjective, the difficulties in combining the two members of the pair in one verse are much greater than they otherwise would be. And similarly, a thought-unit consisting of a substantive and several adjectives, wherever they may be disposed in the verse, will by reason of the number of syllables, easily overflow into the next verse.

In a thorough treatment of Leo's theory predicative expressions should be included. The consciousness of verse-unity could not be better illustrated than in these two couplets:

isque hic compressit virginem adulescentulus  
(vi), vinulentus, multa nocte, in via. (Cist. 158)

quom hasce herbas huius modi in suom alvom congerunt  
formidulosas dietu, non essu modo. (Ps. 823)

But such cases of predicative expressions, involving long words, are apart from our immediate purpose. There are, however, a few cases of adjectives following their substantives (either adjective or substantive is of great length) and not so clearly predicative. Their position makes it possible that they amplify the meaning, in which case this amplifying force as well as length justify the separation. Most of these adjectives are derived from proper nouns; and since in almost all cases the adjectives stand at the beginning of the second verse it is significant to note that in Oscan and Umbrian proper adjectives usually follow their nouns:<sup>3</sup>

Philopolemm vivom, salvom 'et sospitem  
vidi in publica celoce, ibidemque illum adulescentulum  
Aleum una et tuom Stalagmum servom (Capt. 873)

<sup>2</sup> In the *Mostellaria*, for example, out of 90 cases of words of five or more syllables, two-thirds stand at the end of a verse; of the remaining third all but two are metrically impossible at the end. On the other hand words of four syllables are freely disposed in the interior of the verse. Five syllables is, therefore, assumed to be the minimum of length which may be regarded as offering difficulty.

<sup>3</sup> Nilsson, *de collocatione pron. adj. apud Plautum et Terentium* 10 = *Lunds Universitets Års-skrift* 37 (1901).

non ego te ad illum duco dentatum virum  
Macedoniensem, qui te nunc flentem facit: (Ps. 1040)

quem propter, o mea vita?—propter militem  
Babyloniensem, qui quasi uxorem sibi (True. 391)

sed illi patruo huius qui vivit senex  
Carthaginiensi duae fuere filiae: (Poen. 83)

These examples are of somewhat different value. In the first case, the length of *adulscēntulum* and its consequent position (of fifteen occurrences of the word thirteen are at the end of the verse) are the controlling factors: *Alcum* is no more amplifying than in vs. 169 of the same play (*nam cecum hic captivom adulscēntem (intus) Alcum, | prognatum genere summo et summis ditiis*) where the adjective is kept in the same verse with its shorter noun. The next two examples are alike in having the separated adjective followed by the caesural pause and an explanatory *qui*-clause.<sup>4</sup> In the last example, too, we have the caesural pause. Plautine usage of these adjectives points to length as the influential factor. *Carthaginiensis* occurs only at the beginning of the verse (Poen. 59, 84, 963, 997, 1377) with one exception (1124). *Babyloniensis* is less constant: at the beginning in True. 84, penultimate word in True. 203 (here, however, iambic septenarius; in the other cases, senarii); in all three cases the same phrase occurs. So we get *militem | Babyloniensem* (391), *| Babyloniensem militem* (84), *Babyloniensis miles |* (203). It is clear that length and metrical conditions are potent. *Macedoniensis* does not occur again: *Macedonius* takes its place (Ps. 51, 346, 616, 1090, 1152, 1162), and in all the cases except one (346) it stands at the end, different metrical constitution making it convenient in that position: in all the cases of *Macedonius*, however, separation is avoided except in the following couplet:

<sup>4</sup> Cf. True. 83:

quem antehac odiosum sibi esse memorabat mala,  
Babyloniensem militem: is nunc dicitur  
venturus peregre:

here the adjective is not separated, and a demonstrative resumes the description. For relative clauses defining separated adjectives cf. Seymour, Harv. Stud. III (1892) 98 ff., and for explanatory clauses after a separated demonstrative in Plautus cf. below, p. 252.

Pseudolus tuos allegavit hunc, quasi a Macedonio  
milite esset. (Ps. 1162)

In this case the adjective precedes, and the unity of thought is seriously affected. Such a case strengthens our feeling that in the examples in which the adjective follows its noun, it is not so much the amplifying force, which is difficult to prove, as it is the length that conduces to separation.

In a few cases of ordinary attributives, however, the thought, quite as much as the length, justifies the separation:

quom sexaginta milia hominum nno die  
volaticorum manibus occidi meis. (Poen. 472)

The swaggering antithesis of 60,000 and a single day<sup>5</sup> occupies the first verse, and crowds out *volaticorum*; but this adjective is in itself of a length that makes it most adaptable to the extremes of the verse—so in the conversation that follows our passage:

volaticorum hominum?—ita dico quidem.  
—an, opseero, nsquam sunt homines volatici?

Plautus is no slave to such external conditions, however, for the adjective by its separation and prominence produces the climax of surprising absurdity after the antithesis of the preceding verse. Nor is it far-fetched to suggest that the juxtaposition of *volaticorum* and *manibus*, “wings” and “hands,” is not accidental. In both of the following cases the rest of the second verse is an explanation of the separated adjective or substantive,<sup>6</sup> which stands at the beginning of the second verse before a strong pause:

ut in ocellis hilaritudo est, heia, corpus cuius modi,  
subvoluturium—illud quidem, subaquilum volui dicere. (Rud. 421)

novi, Neptunus ita solet, quamvis fastidiosus<sup>7</sup>  
aedilis est; si quae improbae sunt merces, iacetat omnis. (Rud. 372)

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Aul. 70, Aul. frag. 3.

<sup>6</sup> Leo, *Analecta Plautina*: de figuris sermonis II 31, refers to the word-play in *subvoluturium*—*volui*. For a slightly different explanation of a separated adjective cf. below, p. 224. More like our present example, but with a play on verbs, is *Frivolaria*, frag. 8.

<sup>7</sup> In the only other occurrence of the adjective, *fastidiosus* is in the same position (M. G. 1233).



There may be a difference of opinion in the interpretation of the second example: perhaps the second verse explains *fastidiosus* rather than *aedilis*. But in any case *aedilis* comes in as a surprise and, as in the first example, the separation and the position of the unexpected idea enhance the effect.

It is, of course, true that the separation seems more violent in the second case than in the first because the adjective precedes. Similarly in these examples:

quo modo me ludos fecisti de illa conducticia  
fidicina?—factum hercle vero, et recte factum iudico. (Ep. 706)

volo deludi illunc, dum cum hac usuraria  
uxore nunc mihi morigero. (Amph. 980)

In both of these the long prepositional phrase, quite apart from the long adjective, makes separation almost inevitable.<sup>8</sup> Without a preposition the accusative case *fidicinam*—*conducticiam* is accommodated in a single verse in Ep. 313; whereas the same phrase with *usuraria* escapes separation only by occupying an entire verse:

cum Aleumena uxore usuraria. (Amph. 498)

The significant fact is that in all the few occurrences of *conducticia* and *usuraria* the adjectives stand at the end of the verse (Cure. 382, Truc. 72). The same position is the regular habitat of *praesentarius*, so that the following separation may in large measure be referred to the length of the adjective:

vendidit tuos natus aedis.—perii.—praesentariis  
argenti minis numeratis.—quot?—quadraginta.—occidi. (Trin. 1081)

(For other cases of this adjective at the end, Most. 361, 913, Poen. 705, 793.) The explosive alliteration in the first verse may, from Leo's standpoint, partially reestablish the unity of that verse; indeed, from an English point of view the idea "cash down" is a separable idea,<sup>9</sup> but we may not safely attribute it to *praesentarius*.

The fact that *argenti minis* constitutes an almost inseparable

<sup>8</sup> The alliteration in Ep. 707 is also to be noted.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. *mutuos*, below, p. 234.



unit (usually at the end or beginning of a verse) adds to the difficulty. This brings us to examples of long thought-units. Such thought-units may be of two sorts: a substantive attended by a succession of adjectives of equal value, e. g. "a long, lean, rascally, devil of a fellow"; or a substantive accompanied by attributive modifiers of unequal value, e. g. "my own twin sister." Our author is fond of billingsgate, and offers a richer store of the first variety of compounds than we may quote. In general it may be said that such a succession of adjectives is usually so disposed as to accentuate the unity of the verses: the substantive usually precedes or is embraced between groups of attributives; the thought is in a measure complete, and the virtues or vices or indifferent qualities either run over into several verses or occasionally are bound within a single verse, in either case without serious disturbance of verse-unity. A few examples will illustrate these characteristics:

nisi mihi supplicium virgeum (MSS. virgarum) de te datur  
longum, diutinumque, a mane ad vespertum. (M. G. 502)

stat propter virum  
fortem atque fortunatum et forma regia. (M. G. 9, cf. 56-57)

ecquem  
recalvom ad Silanum senem, statutum, ventriosum,  
tortis superciliis, contracta fronte, fraudulentum,  
deorum odium atque hominum, malum, mali viti probrique plenum,  
qui duceret mulierculas duas secum satis venustas? (Rud. 316)

For other examples, Bacch. 280 (if Leo's *strigosum* is accepted), Cas. 767, Men. 402, 487, M. G. 88, Ps. 724, 974, Rud. 125, 313, Truc. 287. In the examples quoted other obvious features will be noticed: in the first, intensification of one idea in one verse: in the second, initial rhyme. There are a few cases of a succession of two or three adjectives in which the unity is not so obvious:

ut aliquem hominem strenuum  
benevolentem adducerem ad te. (Ps. 697)

post altrinsecust securicula ancipes, itidem aurea  
litterata: ibi matris nomen in securicula.<sup>10</sup> (Rud. 1158)

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Rud. 478, 1156-1157.

ibi nunc statuam vult dare auream  
solidam<sup>11</sup> faciundam ex auro Philippo, (Cure. 439)

In all of these the noun and one adjective (or two) stand in the first verse so that the thought is practically complete; *benevolentem*, and *aurea* (as we shall see presently), are metrically convenient in the places which they occupy; the separated adjectives all stand at the beginnings of their respective verses and are not without emphasis; it is also to be noticed that *litterata* is explained in the rest of the verse.

Of the second variety of thought-units, two occur with sufficient frequency to be of significance. These are the expressions for "own twin sister, brother, son," often accompanied by a pleonastic numeral when the expression is in the plural; and the phrase for a sum of money in which *nummi aurei Philippi* in various arrangements, with an accompanying numeral or further attribute, makes an elaborate complex. This latter phrase is usually from eight to thirteen syllables in extent, and on five occasions the longer varieties run over into a second verse:<sup>12</sup>

sunt tibi intus aurei  
trecenti nummi Philippi?—sescenti quoque. (Poen. 165)

qui mihi mille nummum crederet  
Philippum, (Trin. 954)

atque etiam Philippum, numeratum illius in mensa manu,  
mille nummum. (Trin. 965)

hic sunt numerati aurei  
trecenti nummi qui vocantur Philippi. (Poen. 713)

nam ducentis aureis  
Philippis redemi vitam ex flagitio tuam. (Bacch. 1010)

On the contrary, in a large majority of cases similar varieties of the same phrase, not always with *aureus*, are included in a single verse: As. 153, Bacch. 230, 590, 882, 934, 1026, Poen. 670, 732, Trin. 152, 959, 1158.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>11</sup> The proximity of *faciundam* gives *solidam* predicative force in our passage: cf. Cicero, de div. I, 24, 48.

<sup>12</sup> In Pers. 438 *probi numerati* are probably amplifying, as Leo brings out in his punctuation: cf. Pers. 526.

<sup>13</sup> It is not likely that in any of these phrases there was any violent separation (cf. for the usage of the various forms Langen, Beiträge zur Kritik u. Erklärung des Plautus 85 ff., Brix on Trin. 844). At least in

There are a dozen instances of the first phrase, including more than six syllables, and of these only two escape into a second verse: these two are of eleven and ten syllables:

geminam germanam meam  
hic sororem esse inaudivi: eam veni quaesitum. (M. G. 441)

spes mihi est vos inventurum fratres germanos duos  
geminos, una matre natos et patre uno uno die. (Men. 1102)

The second of these (and possibly the first<sup>14</sup>) is only apparent separation: *geminos* is followed by a sense-pause which emphasizes the idea as amplifying, and the elaboration of the same idea in the rest of the same verse gives a distinct unity to that verse. Indeed, *geminus* is elsewhere in the same play a substantive: Men. 26, 40, 68, 69, and if the prologue is of dubious authorship in parts, at least once in the play itself, vs. 1120. In nine cases long forms of this complex are confined to a single verse: Amph. 480, cf. 1070, Men. 18, 232, 1082, 1125, M. G. 238, 383, 391, 717. To be sure, our impression that this situation points to a sensitiveness to verse-unity is momentarily disturbed when we find a much shorter form of the same phrase running over:

sicut soror  
eius huc gemina venit Ephesum et mater accersuntque eam. (M. G. 974)

Only momentarily, for again *gemina* may be substantival; Palaestrio may be working upon the soldier very tactfully,

the separation of *nummus Philippus*, the use of *Philippus* alone, and the examples above (Trin. 954, 965, with *qui vocantur Philippi* in Poen. 714), suggest that the words are separable, either one amplifying the other. When *aureus* (convenient at the verse-end, cf. above and As. 153, Bacch. 230, 590, 934, Trin. 1139) is a part of the phrase, the separation seems more violent; if, however, Bentley's emendation of Bacch. 230 is right, there would be some evidence of a substantival *aureus*, similar to the usage of later times; and one should compare the usage of *χρυσοῖς* as a substantive without *στατήρ* in the fragments of Greek comedy: Jacobi, *comicae dictionis index* s. v. *χρυσοῖς*. The separation of *aureus* is no more than that of a material genitive as in Hippoanax, 22, 4:

καὶ σαμβάλισκα καὶ σκερίσκα καὶ χρυσῶν  
στατήρας ἐξήκοντα τοῦτίρον τοίχων.

But Plautus does not separate the genitive *auri* in this phrase.

<sup>14</sup>The resumptive *eam* in the same verse with *sororem* may help to strengthen the unity of the verse.

slowly unloading his ammunition, "a sister, her twin." (So, perhaps, also in vss. 473-474.) And Leo might add that the alliteration in *sicut soror* reasserts the unity of the first verse.<sup>15</sup>

## II.

In so far as he overcomes the obstacle offered by length in a large majority of cases, Plautus may be said to show respect for the integrity of the verse. But the poet's aversion to separation or his indifference to verse-unity is best tested by conditions in which there are no obstacles in the length of words or thoughts. Some general considerations will help us to appreciate the examples.

In the later Republican prose the substantive is often separated from its attributive by intervening words, and much more frequently in poetry; so far as I know, no effort has been made to discover whether such separation is regulated by any laws or not<sup>16</sup>—whether, for example, certain attributives are more separable than others, whether the intervening words are of some special character, etc. Norden<sup>17</sup> has already pointed out that such separation in early Latin prose is, as regards the number and the nature of the intervening words, subject to limitations. Altenburg<sup>18</sup> has collected the material: usually only one word intervenes, or if more, they constitute a unit of thought. From our present point of view we should like to know whether the attributives themselves show degrees of separability: whether,

<sup>15</sup> Under the head of long thought-units should come Ep. 559, in which the genitive and the adjectives constitute an inseparable compound and perhaps account for the escape of *mulierem*:

accipe, acrumnosam et miseriarum compotem  
mulierem retines.

The same would apply to Nonius's reading *acrumnarum*.

<sup>16</sup> Even the interpretation of the material under discussion in this paper would be facilitated by a study of the collocation of adjective and substantive within the verse, quite apart from the question of separation by the verse.

<sup>17</sup> Die antike Kunstprosa I 179-180, and 180 n. 2.

<sup>18</sup> De sermone pedestri Italorum vetustissimo = JHB. Supplbd. 24 (1898) 523 ff.



for example, the separation of certain pronominal adjectives does not appear earlier than that of ordinary attributives. Perhaps the material is too scanty to lead to convincing generalization; the fact that in Oscan the relative adjective is very regularly separated from its noun and stands at the opposite extreme of the clause lends significance to a similar situation in Plautus.<sup>19</sup> Such observations as Kaibel makes in his study of Aristotle's Athenian Constitution<sup>20</sup> would affect our interpretation of many examples if early Latin prose showed similar characteristics: he notes that certain pronominal adjectives are separated from their substantives with greater frequency and by more intervening words than ordinary attributives; he mentions in the order of such frequency *ὅτος*, *πᾶς*, *ὅλος*, *ἄλλοι*, the relative, *τοσοῦτος*, *ὅσος*, *οὐδέίς*, *ὁ αὐτός*, *τις*; but the last seven are naturally represented only by one or two examples; he also refers to numerals, but without mentioning the frequency of separation in such cases. Altenburg's examples show that some of the corresponding words in Latin are separated in early prose.<sup>21</sup> When we add thereto that in Plautus, quite apart from the question of separation within the verse, the cases of separation by the verse and, often, by intervening words as well, show a relatively large number of pronominal adjectives and numerals, we may suspect that some influence made the disturbance of verse-unity either less violent or more imperative than it appears to us and than it perhaps was in the case of ordinary attributives: in Plautus 20 per cent. of the cases of separation by the verse-end are pronominal adjectives, 25 per cent. possessive adjectives, 15 per cent. numerals. That is, more than half are pronominal words and numerals.

A step towards the explanation of some of these phenomena has been taken by Wackernagel,<sup>22</sup> though without reference to the matter of verse-unity. His investigations in Indogermanic languages, especially Greek and Latin, bring to light survivals

<sup>19</sup> Altenburg, l. c. 530; Norden, l. c. I 181 n. 1.

<sup>20</sup> Stil u. Text der Πολιτεία Ἀθηναίων des Aristoteles 99 ff.

<sup>21</sup> For example, *eteri*, *omnes*, numerals including *nullus*, *alter*, *tantus*, *qui* (rel.), *quis* (indef.).

<sup>22</sup> Indog. Forsch. I 406 ff. Cf. Delbrück, Syntakt. Forsch. III 47.

of a law by which short enclitic words tend to the beginning of a sentence, usually to the second place. Pronominal words are often enclitics, and some pronominal adjectives are directly affected by this law. Others are indirectly affected; for the law of pronominal attraction, combined with Wackernagel's law, will sometimes bring pronominal words that may or may not be enclitics to at least the third place in the sentence. Such laws have precedence of the natural attraction of the adjective to its substantive.

A few other laws affect the collocation of words so fundamentally that verse-unity must waive its claims, whenever it conflicts. Words of the same category are attracted to one another. Certain formulas exist for the expression of certain ideas, e. g., of oaths. Groups of words in Plautus have been studied and peculiarities of collocation discovered. Most of these conditions reflect the usage of ordinary speech. But there are other artificial combinations—whether due to the influence of rhetoric or not we may not always say—resulting often in the interlocking of words and the consequent separation of words that are syntactically connected. All such factors must be appreciated. Apparent violation of verse-unity may be only conservation of these natural or artificial collocations.<sup>23</sup>

Some of these general considerations account for the separate treatment of ordinary attributives, possessive adjectives, other pronominal adjectives, and numerals. All of them will make more intelligible the discussion of individual passages.

In this discussion I do not wish to be understood as representing the attendant features to be the cause of separation or atonement for separation; that would be begging an important question. In viewing the problem of verse-unity with reference to Leo's theory, it is apparent that the cases of separation are often attended by such features as Leo regards to be justifications for

<sup>23</sup> On the various matters here briefly referred to cf. Langen, *Rh. Mus.* 12 (1857) 426 ff.; Kellerhof, *de collocatione verborum Plautina* = *Studemund-Stud.* II 49 ff.; Kämpf, *de pronominum personalium usu et collocatione ap. poet. scaen. Rom.* 16 ff. = *Berliner Studien* III (1886); Leo, *Bemerkungen über plautinische Wortstellungen u. Wortgruppen* = *Nachricht. Götting. Gesell.* (1895) 416, 432-433; Norden, *Aeneis Buch VI*, 386.

separation: a descriptive paper notes the appearance of such features. Quite apart from this descriptive treatment is the important question which Leo's theory involves, namely: is Plautus, under the influence of earlier Latin poetry, conscious of verse-unity in the sense that all cases of separation must be justified by special considerations? Granting that these features attend separation, there is the further question: may any or all of these be proved to be necessarily involved in the relation of thought to verse? For example, alliteration is inherent in Plautus's style: may not its appearance have nothing to do with verse-unity?<sup>24</sup> Furthermore, granting that Plautus is conscious of the individuality of each verse, which may hardly be denied, such consciousness may arise in one of several ways: a poet may be under the influence of a primitive form of verse in which verse and sentence are identical—so Plautus in Leo's theory; or he may be far removed from any such influence and yet preserve the unity of the verse—which is not necessarily lost sight of entirely even in advanced stages of verse-development—either for the purpose of bringing into relief units of thought, or as a concession to an artificial tendency of his time.<sup>25</sup> On a priori grounds Plautus's attitude towards verse-unity may well be suspected of being affected by the Saturnian verse; he is, however, adapting Greek comedies, and the verse-technique of his Greek sources had reached a much higher point than contemporary Latin verse. This counter-influence must be reckoned with in any a priori reasoning. Leo would be the first to recognize the validity of this contention.

None of these important questions is begged in the following descriptive treatment. Some of them may be considered by way of conclusion, but many of them cannot be settled in a study of a few phases of verse-unity. The division of adjectives is but a small part of word-division, and word-division is but a part of

<sup>24</sup> Of course the fact that alliterative groups are usually limited to a single verse in itself shows a consciousness of verse-unity. The question at issue is whether a noun or adjective is separated for the purpose of bringing it into an alliterative group.

<sup>25</sup> Such an artificial preservation of unity appears in Bion: cf. Wilamowitz, *Adonis* 38-39.

a larger topic which includes the division of the larger units of thought, phrases and clauses.

### III.

When an attributive follows its substantive it is often possible that the adjective is amplifying; each case must be interpreted with reference to the context, but the mere possibility justifies us in distinguishing between (*a*) adjectives that follow, and (*b*) those that precede their substantives. Further classification might be desirable, for example, with reference to whether or not words intervene between the adjective and noun; but this would confuse the discussion. I have persuaded myself from an inspection of the *Mostellaria* that the number and the nature of the words that intervene between adjective and noun within the verse are the same in the corresponding situation when a verse-end also intervenes. In some cases it may well be argued that verse-unity was sacrificed to the normal collocation of words. The equally important question whether within the verse the collocation of adjective and noun and intervening words is ever abnormal for the sake of preserving verse-unity is not within the limits of this paper.

#### (*a*)

It is not easy to draw a line between purely predicative and amplifying adjectives. The former, as we saw in examples of long adjectives, are often set off in a separate verse; many are participial:

is ex se hunc reliquit qui hic nunc habitat filium  
pariter moratum ut pater avosque huius fuit. (Aul. 21)

eur inclementer dieis lepidis litteris  
lepidis tabellis lepida conscriptis manu? (Ps. 27)

vilicus is cum corona, candide  
vestitus, lautus, exornatusque ambulat. (Cas. 767)

Somewhat different in effect, but equally separable are these participial adjectives:

miles lenoni Ballioni epistulam  
consriptam mittit Polymachaeroplagides. (Ps. 998)



hominem cum ornamentis omnibus  
exornatum adducite ad me iam ad trapezitam Aeschinum. (Ps. 756)

et tu gnatam tuam  
ornatam adduce lepide in peregrinum modum. (Pers. 157)

“Writes and sends.” “dress up and bring” may suggest the effect of such separation. Such examples, in which the verbal element is prominent, are hardly within the scope of this paper.<sup>26</sup>

I take it that the following group of cases will not be regarded as illustrating real separation; predicative or amplifying as you please, the suggestion of physical or emotional distress is an afterthought, which separation by the verse-end and intervening words, and position in close connection with caesura or diaeresis accentuate:

item parasiti rebus prolatis latent  
in oculo miseri, viciant suco suo. (Capt. 82)

ecastor lege dura vivunt mulieres  
multoque iniquiore miserae quam viri. (Merc. 817)

itaque nos ventisque fluctibusque  
iaetatae exemplis plurimis miserae<sup>27</sup> perpetuam noctem; (Rud. 369)

illa autem virgo atque altera itidem ancillula  
de navi timidæ desuluerunt in scapham. (Rud. 74)

ibi me nescio quis arripit  
timidam atque pavidam, nec vivam nec mortuam. (Cure. 648)

A similar pathetic effect is evident in

mulierculas  
video sedentis in scapha solas duas. (Rud. 162)

<sup>26</sup> Nor present participles as in

nam istae quae tibi renuntiantur, filium  
te velle amantem argento circumducere, (Ps. 430)

<sup>27</sup> So, preceding a pronoun, in a lyrical context:

sed muliebri animo sum tamen: miserae (quom venit) in mentem  
mihi mortis, metu membra occupat. (Rud. 685)

Note the alliteration carried through the couplet with pathetic effect. Another example, of *misera* following a pronoun:

pol me quidem  
miseram odio enicavit. (As. 920)

Nor will there be any doubt that these adjectives are independent:

nunc equos innetos iubes  
capere me indomitos, ferocis, (Men. 862)

*Conviva commodus* in M. G. 642 does not prevent the same adjective from becoming an amplifying expression with the same noun in

convivas volo  
reperire nobis commodos, qui una sient. (Poen. 615)

Here the noun and adjective appear at the extremes of the sentence after and before pauses.<sup>28</sup> In the following case the context shows that *frigidam* is predicative; *calefieri* finds its antithesis in *adponi frigidam*:

calefieri iussi reliquias—pernam quidem  
ius est adponi frigidam postridie. (Pers. 105)

“Served up cold” is clearly the idea.<sup>29</sup>

Nor may I admit as indubitable cases of real separation such substantival adjectives as *virgo* and *posticum*:

eius cupio filiam  
virginem mihi desponderi. (Aul. 172)  
est etiam hic ostium  
aliud posticum nostrarum harum aedium: (St. 449)

*Filiola virgo* (Rud. 39) and *virginem gnatum suam* (Trin. 113) may support the adjectival force of the first adjective, but in any case the separation in our passage defines *filia* and contrasts the daughter of Euclio with the middle-aged woman of Megadorus's previous remarks (162).<sup>30</sup> As for *posticum*, it is clearly

<sup>28</sup> The adjective *molestum* in the following verses is more closely connected with the infinitive:

et impudicum et impudentem hominem addeceat  
molestum ultro advenire ad alienam domum, (Rud. 115)

And one will not take *luculentum* (*luculente* P) as anything but predicative (Ep. 158) after comparing vs. 341 of the same play.

<sup>29</sup> Cf.

memini: ut muraena et conger ne calefierent:  
nam nimio melius oppectuntur frigida. \* (Pers. 110)

<sup>30</sup> So, but with clearly expressed contrast in the second verse, the compound *virgo civis* is divided in

an paulum hoc esse tibi videtur, virginem  
vitiare eivem? conservam esse credidi. (Ter. Eun. 857)

a substantive in Most. 931, and so its diminutive in Trin. 194, 1085; in the Stichus, if not an appositive, it defines *ostium*.<sup>31</sup> The separation of *aliud* does not here concern us.

In connection with substantival adjectives another passage in the Aulularia is to be considered:

namque hoc qui dicat: quo illae nubent divites  
dotatae, si istud ius pauperibus ponitur? (Aul. 489)<sup>32</sup>

The contrast between *divites* and *pauperes* suggests that the former is substantival; but it does not at once follow that *dotatae* is purely adjectival. For vss. 534-5 of the same play show how easily the participial adjective becomes substantival:

nam quae indotata est, ea in potestate est viri;  
dotatae maectant et malo et damno viros.

Similarly Ter. Phor. 938, 940. If, however, it is adjectival in our passage, it adds to and explains *divites* very much as *factiosum* in

venit hoc mihi, Megadore, in mentem ted esse hominem divitem  
factiosum, me autem esse hominem pauperum pauperrimum. (Aul. 226)

In both passages we have the contrast between rich and poor, and in *factiosum* as in *dotatae* the happy isolation at the beginning of the verses of a more specific attribute of the rich class: in each case the emphasis is accentuated by the sense-pause which follows the separated adjective. From a different point of view *hominem divitem* | *factiosum* should be compared with *hominem strenuom* | *benevolentem* (Ps. 697, above, p. 211).

Most of such amplifying ideas are similarly brought into prominence by their position at the beginning of the second verse; often they are followed by a decided sense-pause; sometimes this separation brings them into the vicinity of contrasted

<sup>31</sup> The verse immediately following in the Stichus (450a) contains *posticam partem*, but this verse is not in A, and the division of 450a and 451 in B is suspicious: cf. Leo *ad loc.* If vs. 450a is genuine, as Lindsay seems to regard it in his Oxford text, a purely adjectival force gains some support. Cf. Pauli Festus, 220 M = 276 de Ponor.

<sup>32</sup> In a similar context Menander (585 K.) has a similar separation:

ὅστις γυναῖκ' ἐπὶ κληρον ἐπιθυμεῖ λαβεῖν  
πλουτοῦσαν

ideas.<sup>33</sup> All of these features, with attendant alliteration, are illustrated in

ego te, Philocrates  
false, faciam ut verus hodie reperiare Tyndarus. (Capt. 609)

The separation of an adjective from a vocative is similarly arranged, but here in a succession of epithets (referred to on p. 211), in

Quid ais, homo  
levior quam pluma, pessume et nequissime,  
flagitium hominis, subdole ac minimi preti? (Men. 487)

The surprise of the opprobrious epithet is made more effective by separation and prominent position. The element of surprise, which *false* and *levior*, like *subvulturium* and *volaticorum* among the long adjectives, illustrate, recurs in another example of the vocative; the parasite greets his patron as a veritable god on earth:

o mi Iuppiter  
terrestris, te coepulonus compellat tuos. (Pers. 99)

Without the element of surprise and without so distinct a sense-pause, but, I think, with emphasis *paterni* is separated in

nonne arbitraris eum adulescentem anuli  
paterni signum novisse. (Trin. 789)

So in Poen. 1080 the same adjective stands with emphasis in the same position, though not separated.

Contrast is heightened by alliteration<sup>34</sup> in

quodque concubinam erilem insimulare ausus es  
proberi pudicam meque summi flagiti, (M. G. 508)

and here prominent position is given to the crime rather than the adjective, that the two crimes may occupy the extremes of

<sup>33</sup> For contrasted ideas brought into the same verse by the separation of an adjective cf. Caecilius 221 R<sup>3</sup>:

egon vitam meam  
Atticam contendam cum istae rusticana (tua), Syra?

unless it is an octonarius, as C. F. W. Müller supposes. Bergk's *asticam* brings out the contrast more plainly: cf. *rusticatum* . . . *urbanatum* in Pomponius 7 R<sup>3</sup> (Leo, *Analecta Plautina*: de figuris sermonis II 32).

<sup>34</sup> Cf. *probrum*, *propinqua partitudo* (Aul. 75), *probrum* . . . *partitudo prope* . . . *palam* (Aul. 276).



the verse and the two abused innocents be juxtaposed in *puḍicam meque*. Contrast and comprehensiveness are obtained in this separation of *dexteram*:

age rusum ostende huc manum

dexteram.—em.—nunc laevam ostende.—quin equidem ambas profero. (Aul. 649)

Somewhat different is the collocation in

nixus laevo in femine habet laevam manum,  
dextera digitis rationem computat, ferit femur  
dexterum. (M. G. 203)

Here the contrasted parts occupy different verses; *dexterum* echoes *dextera* of the preceding verse,<sup>35</sup> and the actor's gestures doubtless contributed to the effect; the alliterative features are plain, whether or not part of the poet's intention in separating the adjective.

An adjective expressive of size is naturally liable to separation and prominence;<sup>36</sup> in this example *maximi* is practically predicative; number and size are postponed with dramatic effect:

postquam in eunas conditust  
devolant angues iubati deorsum in impluvium duo  
maximi: continuo extollunt ambo capita. (Amph. 1107)

Essentially attributive, but in effective juxtaposition, the same adjective is postponed with more injury to verse-unity in

summe probus, sum lepidus civis, qui Atticam hodie civitatem  
maximam maiorem feci atque auxi civi femina? (Pers. 474)

The postponement of the verb makes the thought less complete, but the alliterative juxtaposition<sup>37</sup> of the superlative and comparative more than compensates for the separation. When the verb comes in the first verse, the adjective escapes into the second verse with less violence to unity, and in this example is brought

<sup>35</sup> Cf. *usque* . . . | *usque* . . . | *faciebatis* . . . | *fugiebatis* . . . (As. 210-213); *iussin* (As. 424-426); *deam* . . . | *deum* . . . (As. 781-782); *omnes* (Aul. 114-115); *itaque* (Cist. 513-515); *perii* (Mere. 124-125); *egomet* (Mere. 852-854); *ferreas, ferream, ferreas* (Pers. 571-573); *perque* (Poen. 418-420), *pater* . . . | *pater* . . . (Poen. 1260-1261).

<sup>36</sup> Cf. Norden, *Aeneis* Buch VI, 390.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. Cas. 1006, Amph. 704, Capt. 1034, M. G. 1218, Rud. 71, St. 739.

into associations of thought and sound that give the second verse a unity of its own:

nulla igitur dicat: equidem dotem ad te adtuli  
maiores multo quam tibi erat pecunia. (Aul. 498)

So with elaborated emphasis on size:

verum nunc si qua mi obtigerit hereditas  
magna atque luculenta,<sup>38</sup> (Truc. 344)

A necessary specification is added to the noun in

ut opinor, quam ex me ut unam faciam litteram  
longam, meum laqueo collum quando obstrinxero. (Aul. 77)<sup>39</sup>

Alliterative possibilities may have helped attract the adjective into the neighborhood of *laqueo*; the alliteration in *litteram* | *longam* is merely an unavoidable accident.

This prominent position, combined with a sense-pause, sometimes introduces an elaboration of the idea<sup>40</sup> expressed in the separated adjective; so in the elaboration of a joke:

si hercle illic illas hodie digito tetigerit  
invitas, nunc istunc istis invitassitis (Rud. 810)

or with further explanation of the idea as in the examples quoted above (p. 211) in Rud. 1158, and (p. 209) 421, 372.

In two examples in which the long adjective *inhonestus* is set at the beginning<sup>41</sup> of the verse the amplifying idea occupies the entire second verse with predicative effect:

nunc hic ocepit quaestum hunc fili gratia  
inhonestum et maxime alienum ingenio suo. (Capt. 98)

<sup>38</sup> Note the balance between *magna atque luculenta* (345) and *dulce atque amarum* (346).

<sup>39</sup> According to the reading of the MSS. Bacch. 279 belongs here:

ego lebum conspicio  
longum strigorem maleficum exornarier.

But *strigorem* is dubious.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. Norden, *Aeneis* Buch VI, 391.

<sup>41</sup> The same adjective stands in the same position in Ter. Eun. 357. For the occupation of the entire second verse cf. Trin. 750:

sed ut ego nunc adulescenti thesaurum indicem  
indomito, pleno amoris ac lasciviae?

verum quom multos multa admisseeperim  
inhonesta propter amorem atque aliena a bonis: (M. G. 1287)<sup>42</sup>

A few cases remain in which the added ideas, set off at or near the beginning of the second verse, are rather conspicuously linked by alliteration to neighboring words in the same verse; some such cases have been already mentioned, but in the following the alliteration is even more conspicuous:

tum quae hic sunt scriptae litterae, hoc in equo insunt milites  
armati atque animati probe.<sup>43</sup> (Bacch. 941)

quid istie? verba facimus. huic homini opust quadraginta minis  
eeleriter calidis, danistae quas resolvat, et cito. (Ep. 141)

quibus hic pretiis porei veneunt  
sacres sinceri? (Men. 289)

Diaeresis or caesura contribute to the emphasis and independent unity of the amplifying ideas; in the second example the entire second verse has a unity of its own, of which the alliteration is a superficial indication.<sup>44</sup> In the following example, referred to among the cases of successive epithets, the alliteration in both verses brings into relief the distinct unity of each, and the separated adjective, being only the last in an accumulation of epithets, escapes into the second verse without violence:

iam herele ego istos fietos compositos crispas concinnos tuos  
unguentatos usque ex cerebro exvellam. (True. 287)

In M. G. 508 we noted a certain artificiality in *probri pudicam meque summi flagiti* (above, p. 222). The employment of the ends of a verse to set in relief a pair of balanced ideas appears in

“eme, mi vir, lanam, unde tibi pallium  
malacum et calidum conficiatur, tunicaeque hibernae bonae,” (M. G. 687)

The adjectives here are less evidently amplifying, though conceivably separable; the striking feature is the position of each

<sup>42</sup> Omitted in A.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. Accius 308 R<sup>3</sup>:

ut nunc, cum animatus iero, satis armatus sum.

<sup>44</sup> For alliterative groups including *calidus* cf. Cas. 255, 309, Ep. 256; and especially, in connection with our passage:

reperi, comminiscere, cedo calidum consilium cito, (M. G. 226)

pair of adjectives at the opposite extreme of the verse, the first pair varied by the connecting particle *et*. The two substantives are divided between the verses; the verb common to both stands before the diaeresis of the second verse; the alliteration is comparatively unimportant. Cf. Norden, *Aeneis* Buch VI, 383 on similar phenomena in Vergil.

The regularity with which adjectives, following their substantives and separated, stand at the beginning of the second verse, is not appreciably disturbed by a few examples of different dispositions of the separated ideas. So the adjective *sacerrimus*, which regularly appears at the end of a verse in Plautus (Rud. 158, Most. 983), is effectively placed in a verse which constitutes a unity by itself and with alliteration that hisses out the opprobrious epithet:<sup>45</sup>

praesenti argento homini, si leno est homo,  
quantum hominum terra sustinet sacerrimo. (Poen. 89)

Similarly Plautus sets off the accomplishments of the parasite's sun-dial; again superlatives, and to be sure in one case metrically convenient (cf. Merc. 206); and again in a verse that is an independent unit; both this and the former example are essentially predicative:

nam(unum) me puero venter erat solarium,  
multo omnium istorum optimum et verissimum. (Boeotia, 1, 4)

The separated adjective stands after a diaeresis, with reiteration of the same idea at the end of the same verse and in the next verse, in

quia enim filio  
nos oportet opitulari unico.—at quamquam unicus,  
nihil magis ille unicus mihi filius quam ego illi pater: (Cas. 262)

(Cf. Capt. 150: *tibi ille unicus, mi etiam unico magis unicus*.)

A somewhat similar but less explicable separation occurs in

si itast, tesseram  
conferre si vis hospitalem, eecam attuli. (Poen. 1047)

Here the adjective is not demonstrably amplifying (cf. 958,

<sup>45</sup> Cf. Ter. Hee. 85:

minime equidem me oblectavi, quae cum milite  
Corinthum hinc sum profecta inhumanissimo:



1052, where it precedes the noun), though it may be felt as an afterthought; the association of thought in *eccam attuli* may have drawn it from its noun; but the interruption, by the verse-end, of the artificial interlocking of *tesseram conferre si vis hospitalem*—a thought-unit embraced between noun and adjective—is striking. The examples above (Poen. 615, Pers. 105, p. 220) are similar, but the adjectives in those cases are more clearly amplifying or predicative.

We have reviewed the cases in which the separated adjectives follow their substantives:<sup>46</sup> such adjectives have very regularly stood at the beginning of the second verse and usually with a caesura or sense-pause immediately following; with few exceptions they have been added ideas, the separation of which was accomplished without violence to verse-unity; many of them, indeed, were almost if not quite predicative; most of them gained by separation, through acquiring emphasis, or producing antithesis or sound-effects. There is perhaps only one doubtful case:

quin potius per gratiam  
bonam abeat abs te. (M. G. 1125)

It may hardly be said that *bonam* adds to the thought, for *per gratiam* is sufficient in itself (M. G. 979, 1200, and St. 71 according to Leo, Bemerkungen über pl. Wortstellungen etc. 418 and Lindsay, Class. Rev. S [1894] 159). *Bona gratia* is, of course, Plautine (Baech. 1022, Rud. 516). The same idea, expressed in the same play, vs. 979,

vin tu illam aetutum amovere, a te ut abeat per gratiam?

makes us suspect that in 1125 the poet availed himself of the pleonastic adjective and of separation for the sake of the reitera-

<sup>46</sup> Most. 501 should be added:

hospes me hic necavit, isque me  
defodit insepultum clam (ibidem) in hisce aedibus,  
secelestus, auri causa. nunc tu hinc emigra:  
secelestae hae sunt aedes, impiast habitatio.

The afterthought *secelestus* is echoed in *secelestae*. *Insepultum* needs no comment: cf. *defodit in terram dimidiatos* in Cato's Speeches, XXXVII 3.

tion of a- and b-sounds, just as a consideration for a- and t-sounds affected the structure of vs. 979.<sup>47</sup>

(b)

It is obvious that the cases of separation in which the adjective appears in the first verse, and the substantive in the second, necessarily involve the incompleteness of the first verse. In most of the cases enumerated in the previous paragraphs the adjectives ranged from purely predicative to loosely amplifying; the thought was in a measure complete in the first verse, especially if the verb came in that verse; the separation was apparent rather than real. The examples about to be discussed may seem, *per se*, to impair the validity of Leo's theory; it is important, therefore, to note that they are few in number. Nor is it impossible that in spite of the separation the noun or adjective may be so related to the context as to reinforce to some extent the unity of the verses.

It may be well to quote at once a striking example of the realization of this possibility. In one passage already quoted we have seen some evidence of a rather studied disposition of adjectives and substantives (M. G. 687, above, p. 225). The case before us shows evidence of even more care in the collocation of words:

aequo mendicus atque ille opulentissimus  
censetur censu ad Acheruntem mortuos. (Trin. 493)

It is perhaps annoying to enumerate the features of this couplet, which are sufficiently plain to any sympathetic reader or hearer. In the first place, the thought is incomplete until the caesura of the second verse is reached. Yet the separation of *aequo* from *censu* is attended by an effective juxtaposition of ideas in the first verse, which gives to that verse a partial unity.<sup>48</sup> The sep-

<sup>47</sup> Appuhn, l. c. 67-68, distinguishes sharply between dissyllabic and trisyllabic adjectives, and maintains that the former may not be separated. There does not seem to me to be any evidence to warrant such a distinction, and it lacks inherent probability. His contention that *bonam* is unemphatic and absorbed in the first foot, may ease the separation, but does not explain it.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. Cist. 532:

postremo quando aequa lege pauperi cum divite  
non licet,

aration of *censu* results in a *figura etymologica* and consequent unity of sound- and sense-effect. And *mortuos* at the end carries us back to the nouns of the first verse in such a way as to establish the unity of the couplet by the close interlocking of ideas.<sup>49</sup>

A phase of ἀπὸ κοινοῦ is illustrated in the following case:

deceit innocentem qui sit atque innoxium  
servom superbum esse, apud erum potissimum. (Ps. 460)

The thought is again incomplete until we reach the caesura of the second verse; yet there is a fitness in the transference of *servom* to the side of *superbum*, with which it belongs as much as with the adjectives of the preceding verse, and to which alliterative opportunities (cf. As. 470) attract it. The significance of this example is clearer on comparing it with the recurrence of the same thought without separation of the adjective in

deceit innocentem servom atque innoxium  
confidentem esse, suom apud erum potissimum. (Capt. 665)

In both passages the verse preceding the couplet contains the adverb *confidenter*, and this adverb prompts the commonplace in each case: in the Capt. the poet repeats the idea of the adverb in the corresponding adjective; in the Ps. he chooses a synonym. It is not, of course, possible to discover whether in the latter case his choice was determined by a desire to avoid the recurrence of the same stem or whether the alliterative unit *servom superbum* came to his mind independently of any consciousness of monotony in the repetition *confidenter—confidentem*. But in any case the comparative artificiality of the couplet from the Ps. is evident: the development in freedom of technique is clear.<sup>50</sup> Without discounting the value of other factors may we

<sup>49</sup> Nor is the emphasis on *aequo* to be overlooked; cf. the Greek equivalent in Menander 538 K:

κοινὸν τὸν Ἀιδην ἔσχον οἱ πάντες βροτοί.

The tragic seriousness of the speaker in the Trinummus perhaps explains the artificial style, which adds dignity to the expression (Leo, *Plaut.* Forsch. 122 and note 5).

<sup>50</sup> The hiatus in Capt. 665 is perhaps a part of the crudity of composition.

not say that when once the alliterative unit occurred to him the unity of sound proved superior to the affinity of the attributive for its noun, and that this conservation of unity of sound was made easier or perhaps suggested by the fact that there was a strong unity of thought as well which linked *servom* to *superbum*? By this question we do not imply any conscious intent on the poet's part; we mean simply to suggest that the two examples seem to us to prove that the poet's technique on occasion had got beyond the point of preserving the more natural and obvious unity of thought, and shows here as elsewhere a sensitiveness to unity of sound and to the more artificial phases of unity of thought.

In this connection, properly, we should note the isolation of an adjective in the first verse by the transposition of its noun to a relative clause that occupies the second verse:<sup>51</sup>

nisi qui meliorem adferet  
quae mi atque amicis placeat condicio magis, (Capt. 179)

It will be granted that this is analogous to our previous example: again the noun, to which two attributive ideas belong, is expressed with the second.

Somewhat similar, too, are these cases in which a noun common to two adjectives is separated from the first adjective, and stands at the beginning of the second verse before a sense-pause; the second adjective stands in the same verse with the noun:

multis et multigeneribus opus est tibi  
militibus: primumdum opus est Pistorensibus; (Capt. 159)

quam ego postquam aspexi, non ita amo ut sani solent  
homines, sed eodem pacto ut insani solent. (Merc. 262)

The sound-effects, especially in the tetrasyllabic rhyme in the second case, are obvious.

<sup>51</sup> The figure of speech involved, without separation by the verse, is easily paralleled in Plautus and other poets: for examples cf. Bach, *de attractione* . . . *inversa* ap. scriptores latinos 16; Vahlen, *Hermes* 17 (1882) 598-599; Leo, *Analecta Plautina: de figuris sermonis* I 20. If, however, separation by the verse occurs, the adjective is usually a demonstrative: cf. Rud. 1065. Poen. 449 (quoted below, p. 254).



Equally studied is the juxtaposition of different ease-forms of the same word; the separation that results may indicate that the attraction of words of the same stem for each other<sup>52</sup> is stronger than the attraction of the attributive to its noun or than any sensitiveness to verse-unity:

nam ex uno puteo similior nunquam potis  
aqua aquai<sup>53</sup> sumi quam haec est atque ista hospita. (M. G. 551)

Again the thought reaches a partial completion at the caesura; the four objects in two pairs are grouped in the second verse; and the sound-effect in *aqua aquai* was doubtless not ungrateful to the audience. This example, too, gains in significance from the occurrence of the same thought in another form:

nam ego hominem hominis similiorem nunquam vidi alterum.  
neque aqua aquae nec lacte est lactis, crede mi, usquam similis.  
quam hic tui est, tuque huius autem; (Men. 1088)

Here it is worth noting that the second example, which is without separation, shows all the simplicity and explicit fulness of an early and undeveloped style; the identity of sentence and verse is almost as exact as in the early Saturnian verse. The first example, on the contrary, shows a freer technique: the thought is more condensed, less explicit; verse-unity is less scrupulously preserved. We have a suggestion before us of a difference, if not of a development, in verse-technique in the course of the poet's activity.

Artificiality in the disposition of words is clearly discernible in

non meministi me auream ad te afferre natali die  
lunulam atque anellum aureolum in digitum? (Ep. 639)

The chiasmic arrangement of the pairs of substantives and adjectives, the consistent diminutives in the second verse in contrast with *auream* in the first verse, and the artificial interlocking of the words are the noticeable features. So far as any unity is discoverable, it consists only in such unity as appeals to the ear

<sup>52</sup> For other examples cf. Kiessling, Rh. Mus. 23 (1869) 411 ff., Kellerhof, l. c. 58-60.

<sup>53</sup> The traces of *acque* in A and B (both, however, corrected to *aquae*) need not detain us: cf. Men. 1089 quoted above.

from the different sound-effects of each verse—a-sounds predominating in the first verse, l-, m-, u-, and n-sounds in the second; certainly there does seem to be something conscious in the change from *aurcam* of the first verse to *aurcolum* of the second; we may properly maintain that the unity of form and of sound-effects in the second verse could have arisen only from a consciousness that the second verse was a distinct entity. At the same time the fact that the consciousness expresses itself only in a superficial or external preservation of verse-unity, and that unity of thought is interrupted, suggests that “art-poetry” in Plautus’s hands was on occasion further advanced than the chronological proximity of Saturnian verse would lead us to suspect.

In contrast with merely superficial observance of unity stand a few cases of separation in which the thought serves to reassert the unity of the verse:

hosticium hoc mihi

domicilium est, Athenis domus est Atticis; ego istam domum  
neque moror neque vos qui homines sitis novi neque scio. (M. G. 450)

Alliteration, to be sure, may have attracted *hosticum* to *hoc*, but the dominant factors are emphasis and contrast. *Hosticum* is first in the sentence because emphasis brings it to that position. *Domicilium* is first in the verse<sup>54</sup> because emphasis again demands for it a prominent position: it must stand in the same verse with *domus* to bring out the contrast between “house” and “home.” The effect may be suggested in English by “Stop! a *stranger’s* | *house* you point me to; *my home’s* in Athens; for *your home* | I care not, nor know I who you gentlemen may be.”

Another passage in which at first sight unity seems to be disregarded, when studied in the light of the context, shows considerable consciousness of the intimate association of verse-unit and thought-unit:

habui numerum sedulo: hoc est sextum a porta proximum  
angiportum, in id angiportum me devorti iusserat;  
quotumas aedis dixerit, id ego admodum incerto scio. (Ps. 960)

<sup>54</sup> But *est domicilium* in CD. Note also *hostium* (*ost*—) BCD.

Here, again, it may be said that *porta* has attracted the alliterative *proximum*, but the verse-division represents a corresponding division of thought. The beginning of the first verse leads up to the number and precise location; *angiportum*, separated from its two adjectives, stands out at the beginning of the second verse, again with emphasis, and is repeated<sup>55</sup> with the resumptive pronoun—all of which heightens the contrast with *aedis* of the third verse. The effect is: "I've got the *number* right: the *sixth*, (in going from the gate), | *alley-way*, that's the *alley-way* I was told to take; | but the number of the *house*, that I've clean forgotten."

Perhaps the existence of any unity in the following example will be less readily granted:

coepti observare equi maiorem filius  
mihi honorem haberet quam eius habuisset pater. (Aul. 16)

There seem to be two prominent factors in the separation: the comparative degree is attracted to the ablative of degree of difference;<sup>56</sup> alliteration brings together *honorem* and *haberet*.<sup>57</sup> Yet is it too fanciful to say that in spite of the separation the position of *filius* and *pater* at the ends of their verses<sup>58</sup> suggests a unity of thought quite apart from and above the syntactical and alliterative unity of each verse? The two verses are comparable to the two pans of the scale, the son balancing the father, and *maiorem* alongside of *filius* marking the turn of the balance which the expectant Lar anticipates.<sup>59</sup>

<sup>55</sup> Examples of such repetition may be found in Bach, *de usu pron. demonstrat.* = Studemund-Stud. II 353-354.

<sup>56</sup> See the examples in Fraesdorff, *de comparativi gradus usu Plautino* 31 ff. Other factors, external or internal, may have precedence over the natural juxtaposition of the ablative of degree and the comparative, but the generalization above is not thereby endangered.

<sup>57</sup> Cf. *honus homini* Trin. 697, *meque honorem illi habere* True. 591, *mihi honores suae domi habuit mazumos* Pers. 512, *habuit, me habere honorem* As. 81.

<sup>58</sup> To be sure, they owe their position in some measure to metrical convenience: cf. vss. 12, 21, 30 of the same prologue.

<sup>59</sup> It is not likely that the following example involves separation (but note *vinum Chium* in Cure. 78):

ubi tu Leucadio, Lesbio, Thasio, Chio,  
vetustate vino edentulo aetatem inriges. (Poen. 699)

Nor can I be sure that my understanding of the next case will prove convincing. The adjective *mutuos* is occasionally separated in expressions of the ideas of borrowing and lending; in two of the cases the adjective follows the noun, in one the adjective precedes. For purposes of comparison I include them all here, although the former belong in the previous section:

tecumque oravi ut nummos sescentos mihi  
dares utepdos *mutuos*. (Pers. 117)

sed quinque inventis opus est argenti minis  
*mutuis*, quas hodie reddam: (Ps. 732)

sed potes nunc *mutuam*  
drachumam dare unam mihi, quam eras reddam tibi? (Ps. 85)

The frequent collocation of this adjective with *dare* and *rogare* in commercial phrases may have given it a substantival force corresponding to the English "loan": so, for example, *exorare mutuom* in Pers. 43 (with *argentum* far distant in 39) suggests that the adjectival force is approximately substantival,<sup>60</sup> and eventually this substantival usage becomes established; even in Plautus we have *tute si pudoris egeas, sumas mutuom* (Amph. 819). If this is granted, the separation becomes innocuous, even if the adjective precedes; the alliteration in the last example perhaps adds to the unity of the verse, but no such additional feature is necessary if *mutuam* is in effect appositional.

The cases hitherto discussed have shown, in varying degrees, consciousness of verse-unity and conservation of it to some extent in spite of the separation of the attributives. The examples we have now to consider do not so plainly point to a sensitiveness to the identity of verse- and sense-unit. There are often extenuating circumstances, but in most cases we must admit that the separation involves a distinct interruption of a thought-unit with less effectual employment of the features that in other examples reinforced the unity of the verse. Prominent

<sup>60</sup> Cf. Ps. 294:

nullus est tibi quem roges  
*mutuom* argentum?—quin nomen quoque iam interiit "*mutuom*."

As. 248 and Trin. 1051 also show *mutuos* in a sense approximately substantival. The various forms of *facere mutuom* are hardly parallel.

among these is a group of superlatives of cretic measurement which may owe their separation in part to metrical convenience; occasionally there result sound-effects that may have conduced to separation, but in general the violation of unity is unmistakable, and the palliating or counteracting features are superficial. It is, however, always to be remembered that the cases of separation are extremely few in proportion to the number of occurrences of a given adjective at the end of a verse. The most important member of this group is *maxumus*, which we have already found separated, but following its noun and standing at the beginning of the second verse with emphasis. This adjective appears 86 times in Plautus: 39 times at the end of the verse, 38 times in the interior, nine times at the beginning. It is not likely that, under normal conditions, the position at the verse-end is prompted by a desire to emphasize;<sup>61</sup> generally unemphatic words occupy this position. A collection of all the examples of the phrase *opere maxumo*, with and without separation, will illustrate the feature of metrical convenience:<sup>62</sup>

nam rex Seleucus me opere oravit maxumo (M. G. 75)

nunc te hoc orare iussit opere maxumo (Most. 752)

pater Calidori opere edixit maxumo (Ps. 897)

rogare iussit ted ut opere maxumo (St. 248)

iussit maxumo

opere orare, ut patrem aliquo absterreris modo, (Most. 420)

non hercle vero taceo. nam tu maxumo

me opsecravisti opere, Casinam ut poseerem uxorem mihi (Cas. 992)

Cf. Terence,

Thais maxumo

te orabat opere, ut eras redires. (Eun. 532)

<sup>61</sup> Such a position for emphasis is occupied at least once by the very words with which we are now concerned:

ego miserrumis perielis sum per maria maxuma  
vectus, capitali periclo per praedones plurimos  
me servavi, (Trin. 1087)

<sup>62</sup> The significance of the cases of separation is somewhat more apparent when we note that *magno opere*, *maiore opere*, *nimio opere*, *tanto opere* are never separated in Plautus by the verse-end.



It is evident that *opere* is attracted to *orare* and *opsecrare*, but so far as the thought is concerned, there is nothing to diminish the violence in the division of *maxumo opere* in Most. 420, or the division of the larger word-groups in Cas. 992 and Eun. 532. And in the first of the two following cases of *maxumus* there are no sound-effects to relieve the separation; in the second, separation brings together m- and a-sounds; these are, however, from lyrical passages:

ubi quisque institerat, concidit crepitu. ibi nescio quis maxuma  
voce exclamat: (Amph. 1063)

quam malum? quid machiner? quid comminiscar? maxumas  
nugas ineptus incipisso.<sup>63</sup> haereo. (Capt. 531)

Cf. Terence,

Geta, hominem maxumi  
preti<sup>64</sup> te esse hodie iudicavi animo meo; (Ad. 891)

Consideration for sound and the artificial arrangement of words may have played some part in the structure of these verses:

Alexandrum magnum atque Agathoelem aiunt maxumas  
duo res gessisse: quid mihi fiet tertio,  
qui solus facio facinora immortalia? (Most. 775)

The a-sounds are prominent in the first verse; *magnum* and *maxumas* are perhaps not unintentionally put in the same verse; *duo*, interlocked between *maxumas* and *res*, is in contrast with *tertio* at the other extreme of the same verse.<sup>65</sup>

Another superlative *optumus* occurs at the end of the verse in one third of the total number of its occurrences; in only one case does its position result in separation:

<sup>63</sup> *Ineptias incipisse* is the reading of the MSS.

<sup>64</sup> Contrast with this the stereotyped position at the end of the verse, without separation, of *minimi preti*, *parvi preti*, *magni preti*, *quantivis preti* in Plautus (cf. Rasso, de Plauti substantivis s. v. *pretium* GS.=JHB. Supplbd. 12 (1881) 710).

<sup>65</sup> Cf. *altera . . . altera*, Aul. 195; *superi . . . inferi*, Aul. 368; *miserius . . . dignius*, Bacch. 41; *malefactorem . . . beneficium*, Bacch. 395; *meam . . . tuam*, Capt. 632. It is interesting to note in this connection a couplet in *bacchiacae* verse:

sed vero duae, sit scio, maxumo uni  
populo cuilibet plus satis dare potis sunt, (Poen. 226).

sed, ere, optuma  
vos video opportunitate ambo advenire. (Ep. 202)

With this should be compared

optuma opportunitate ambo advenistis. (Merc. 964)

Next in significance to the rarity of the separation is the fact, attested by the verse from the Merc., that the initial sounds *op—v—v—op* are the external manifestation of unity which is certainly interrupted by the end of the verse. Such a case is far from disturbing Leo's theory. Such interlocked complexes of thought and sound, which are characteristic of the language, must burst the bonds that confine units of thought within the verse; that they do it so rarely is significant.

A third superlative that, like *optumus*, stands at the end of the verse in one third of the total number of its occurrences is *plurimus*. The singular and the plural of this word are perhaps on a different footing: the plural is conceivably analogous to the separation of *omnes*;<sup>66</sup> so, for example, in this case of *plurimi* in the interior of a verse, the separation seems less violent than in cases of the singular:<sup>67</sup>

plurimi ad illum modum  
periere pueri liberi Carthagine. (Poen. 988)

Whether this is true in the case of the following feminine plural is not at once patent to an English auditor:

O Gripe, Gripe, in aetate hominum plurumae  
fiunt transennae, ubi decipiuntur dolis. (Rud. 1235)

In any case, the singular seems at first to be rather rudely separated in

miles Lyconi in Epidauro hospiti  
suo Therapontigonus Platagidorus plurumam  
salutem dicit. (Cure. 429)

Here the conventional phrases of epistolary address run along naturally and result in two separations, with the first of which

<sup>66</sup> Cf. below, p. 258.

<sup>67</sup> In Eph. 391 *pluruma* (*plurimum* MSS.) is predicative.

we are not now concerned, but verse-unity is suggested in the alliterative colligation of *Platagidorus plurumam*; the effect is as if *plurumam* were an adverb and *salutem dicit* no more than *salvere iubet*, as the following example suggests:

erum atque servom plurumum Philto iubet  
salvere, Lesbonieum et Stasinum. (Trin. 435)

in which, again, we have similar alliteration—*plurumum Philto*, pronounced *Pilto*. So, too, our explanation is confirmed by

multam me tibi  
salutem iussit Therapontigonus dicere (Cure. 420)

in which, as in the other cases, *multam me* are attracted to each other, while *salutem iussit* like *salutem dicit* and *salvere* stands at the beginning of the second verse.<sup>68</sup>

The adjective *parvolus* occurs thirteen times: nine times at the end of a verse, three times with separation. Of these three, one belongs in our examples of adjectives following their nouns, and is a mere afterthought:

nam mihi item gnatae duae  
cum nutrice una sunt surruptae parvolae. (Poen. 1104)

The other two, both from the same play and of the same situation, are cases of violent and absolute separation:<sup>69</sup>

nam ego illanc olim quae hinc flens abiit parvolam  
puellam proiectam ex angiportu sustuli. (Cist. 123)

nam mihi ab hippodromo memini adferri parvolam  
puellam eamque me mihi supponere. (Cist. 552)

A comparison with three cases in Terence justifies us in attributing the separation in large measure to metrical convenience:

ibi tum matri parvolam  
puellam dono quidam mercator dedit (Eun. 108)

<sup>68</sup> On the other hand, without separation, but again in alliterative colligation in

Veneri dicito  
multam meis verbis salutem. (Poen. 406)

<sup>69</sup> The alliteration, interrupted by the verse-end, in *parvolam* | *puellam* has no significance, for it is accidental: the range of expressions for the idea is too limited to admit our regarding it as genuine alliteration.

nisi si illa forte quae olim periit parvola  
soror, hanc se intendit esse, ut est audacia. (Eun. 524)

ah, stultitias istae, non pudor. tam ob parvolam  
rem paene e patria! (Ad. 274)

In the second example sense as well as sound may connect *periit parvola*—"died in infancy," and in the last there are sound-effects that reassert the unity of the verses.<sup>70</sup>

So much for this group of cretic adjectives;<sup>71</sup> the following participial adjectives may be more easily separable because of

<sup>70</sup> Something might be said for a substantival force in *parvola*, though it could hardly apply to the last example from Terence: such a force is possible in Ter. Eun. 155:

parvola  
hinc est abrepta;

the substantival force is evident in Terence's *a parvolo* (And. 35, Ad. 48) = *a puero*. The nearest approach to it in Plautus is in Poen. 896, 1346, but it is not certain in either place; nor is Ps. 783 a clear case. Cf. Lorenz, Pseudolus, Einleitung p. 59.

<sup>71</sup> Before leaving these examples in which metrical convenience seems to be a factor in the separation, I may call attention to a closely related phenomenon which, it seems to me, is not always recognized. Is not the stereotyped position of certain words in the verse often nothing more than the working of the poet's mind along the path of well-worn "grooves," as a psychologist might express it? For example, in the cases above in which *salutem iussit* or *dicit*, or *salvere iubet*, appear, the position of *salutem* and *salvere* (rather regularly at the beginning of the verse, though not uniformly) can hardly be attributed to metrical convenience alone: it is to some extent a matter of habit. A better example is furnished by these examples from Euripides's *Iphigeneia in Tauris*:

τολμητέον τοι ξεστόν ἐκ ναῦν λαβεῖν  
ἀγάλμα πάσας προσφέροντε μηχανάς. (111)

Φοῖβος μ' ἐπεμψε δεῦρο, διοπετὲς λαβεῖν  
ἀγάλμ' Ἀθηνῶν τ' ἐγκαθιδρῖσαι χθονί. (977)

σὺν τοῖς ξένοισιν οἴχεται, σμυνὸν θεῶς  
ἀγάλμ' ἔχονσα· δόλια δ' ἦν καθάρματα. (1315)

τὸ τ' οὐρανοῦ πέσημι, τῆς Διὸς κόρης  
ἀγάλμα. ναὺς δ' ἐκ μέσης ἐφθέξατο  
βοή τις. (1384)

Those of us who are reluctant to admit metrical convenience as a factor may find some comfort in emphasizing the part that mental habit plays in the regular appearance of certain words in the same part of the verse. *Ἀγάλμα* in the verses above seems to me to owe its position to this rather than anything else.

the peculiar nature of the adjective, and the balanced isolation of *pater*:

salve, insperate nobis  
pater, te complecti nos sine.—cupite atque exspectate  
pater, salve. (Poen. 1259)

The greetings are from two sisters with artificial variation of the conventional terms: the imperatives and vocatives are arranged in chiasmic order; *pater* stands at the beginning of each verse,<sup>72</sup> leaving the adjectives at the end in each case. The collocation is the same as in

o salve, insperate multis annis post quem conspicio  
frater, (Men. 1132)

according to MS. B, but the other members of the Palatine family (and A apparently agrees) introduce a change of speakers before *frater*. Even if we agree with the editors in following A and the majority of the Palatine family, the isolation of the participial vocative, and the relative clause that modifies it, may point to a certain degree of separability in the participial adjectives *insperate*, *cupite*, and *exspectate* in our passage.<sup>73</sup>

There remains a small group of cases in which verse-unity seems to be lost sight of, and which are alike in that the adjectives are of four syllables metrically convenient at the end of the verse:

pol istic me haud centesumam  
partem laudat quam ipse meritust ut laudetur laudibus. (Capt. 421)

haud centesumam  
partem dixi atque, otium rei si sit, possum expromere. (M. G. 763)

si quisquam hanc liberali  
causa manu assereret, (Cure. 490)

ne epistula quidem ulla sit in aedibus  
nec cerata adeo tabula; et si qua inutilis  
pictura sit, eam vendat: (As. 763)

*Centesumus* occurs only in these two places in Plautus; *liberali causa* occurs in the interior of the verse in Poen. 906, 964, 1102,

<sup>72</sup> Cf. above, p. 223, n. 35.

<sup>73</sup> Fergusson, de vocativi usu Plautino Terentianoque 32, defends the reading of B in Men. 1132 on the ground that *insperate* is not found in Plautus without an accompanying noun.



and so *liberali manu* in Cure. 668, 709; *inutilis* occurs again in Ps. 794 and at the end of the verse. But the separation in these cases is not entirely a matter of length and metrical convenience: the collocation of the other words in the sentence is so fixed by almost inviolable laws that it is not surprising that the adjective should escape into the second verse. For to anybody familiar with Plautus and with Wackernagel's study of the position in the sentence of enclitic words it will be clear that the collocations *pol istic me*, *si quisquam hanc*, and *et si qua* are to a considerable extent fixed in the usage of the language; the increased difficulty of conserving verse-unity is obvious.<sup>74</sup>

The very fact that in some 15,000 verses so few cases of separation occur—and this in spite of the fondness of the Roman for interlocked complexes which would seem to make the preservation of verse-unity difficult—clearly attests the sanity of Leo's contention. The further fact that in so many of the few cases of separation the unity of the verse reasserts itself through association of thought or sound confirms in large measure his requirement of special justification when separation does occur. The existence of a few cases in which unity is not apparent need not affect the validity of the principle; the essential unity of the verse so far as attributive adjectives are concerned is clear at once from comparison with a tragedy of Euripides or of Seneca—clearer than any statistics could make it.

#### IV.

The large proportion of possessive adjectives among the cases of separation deserves an explanation. They represent one-fourth of the total; indeed if we eliminate cases of merely apparent separation the proportion would be even larger.

No small part of the explanation is found, of course, in the relative frequency of the possessive adjectives in the conversa-

<sup>74</sup> In As. 763 ff. there is perhaps some effect in the position of the nouns *epistula*, *cerata tabula*, *pictura* at or near the beginning of successive verses. The resumptive *can* may also reinforce the unity of the last verse.

tional Latin of the plays. That among 3000<sup>75</sup> cases of possessive adjectives only about 60 should be separated from their substantives by the verse-end may seem in itself some slight tribute to verse-unity rather than a contravention of it. Yet the obvious violence to the unity of thought, at least from an English standpoint, in dividing "thy son" between two verses makes even a small percentage seem inexplicably large. We must not, however, allow our English standpoint to influence us. The separation of "thy son" by the verse-end in English is not altogether analogous to the separation of *filius* from *tuos*. For in the Latin sentence the phrase corresponding to "thy son" is much less of an independent unit of thought than in the English sentence: in the Latin sentence, largely because the possessives *meus*, *tuos*, *suos* are generally unemphatic and often without accent in the phrase- or sentence-unit, the division by the verse-end does not separate "thy" from "son," but rather divides a larger unit of thought. It is clear, for example, that *tuos emit aedis filius* (Most. 670) constitutes a unit of thought; and so, too, does *aedis filius* | *tuos emit* (Most. 637, cf. 997). The separation in this latter case, if any is felt, is rather that of *aedis filius* from *tuos emit* than merely of *filius* from *tuos*. Furthermore, since the possessive adjectives *meus*, *tuos*, *suos* are generally unemphatic in our examples, it is possible and likely that in this example *tuos* was absorbed in the rhythmical unit *tuos emit* without much consciousness of any violence in separating *tuos* from *filius* by the verse-end: the frequency and ease with which words intervene between these possessives and their substantives (quite apart from separation by the verse-end) may support this contention. Even if the possessive had some slight stress upon it, as in the beginning of trochaic verses and rarely in an iambic verse (*filiam* | *suam despondit*, Cist. 600), certainly such stress was subordinate: *suam*, despite some quantitative prominence, must have been merged in the surrounding words.<sup>76</sup> Of course it may be ob-

<sup>75</sup> Nilsson, l. c. 12.

<sup>76</sup> Some such idea is expressed by Appuhn, l. c. 63, but in a way that fails to account for trochaic verses and Cist. 600. I hope it is clear that

jected that the thought would lead us to merge it in the preceding, rather than in the following word, in the example quoted, and that the possessive is enclitic,<sup>77</sup> not proclitic. For our present purpose it is enough that the possessive is absorbed in a larger unit, and that the separation by the verse-end is by no means the same as that involved in the division between verses of the English possessive and its substantive.<sup>78</sup>

In the second place it is to be noted that the possessives are subject to at least one influence from which ordinary attributives are free: Kämpf,<sup>79</sup> and others before him, observed the attraction of pronominal words to one another. Such attraction appears in a relatively small number of our examples:<sup>80</sup>

eam meae | uxori (Men. 480),  
 illam quae meam | gnatam (Cist. 547),  
 tu mihi tua | oratione (As. 112),  
 ad illam quae tuom | . . . filium (Bacch. 406),  
 fores conservas | meas a te (As. 386),

the paragraph above is not intended to offer any complete explanation of the separation, but only to suggest that the separation, such as it is, is probably by no means so harsh as it appears to us. The point that I wish to make is that the unemphatic possessive has very little independent force and is not merely "swallowed up" (Appuhn) metrically, but absorbed in larger thought-units even of ordinary speech.

<sup>77</sup> Lindsay, *Latin Language* 167; but cf. E. Wallstedt, *Från Filologiska Föreningen: Språkliga Uppsatser* III (Lund 1906) 189 ff.; also Radford, *Trans. Amer. Phil. Assoc.* 36 (1905) 190 ff. Neither of these last two articles was accessible to me in time to use them for the discussion above.

<sup>78</sup> The fact that the genitive case is used in appositional relation to the possessives (e.g. *mea unius opera*) might lead to the suggestion that the separation is not more serious than that of a possessive genitive. This would be a helpful suggestion if the possessive genitive in Plautus were regularly or even frequently separated from its noun by the verse; cases do occur (e. g. Bacch. 901, Rud. 1079, Cist. 544), but rarely; and the possessive genitive with *pater*, *uxor*, *filius*, *mater*, which are the nouns most frequently appearing in our cases of the separated possessive adjective, is in Plautus almost inseparable from its noun even by intervening words.

<sup>79</sup> Kämpf, l. c. 16 ff.

<sup>80</sup> A few cases, though too few to be significant, of a verse-end intervening between pronominal words thus combined are worth noting: *tua | me* Cas. 279-280, *meam | me* Cist. 98-99, *me | meam* Ep. 480-481, *mea | meae* M. G. 738-739, *se | suamque* Trin. 109-110, *tibi | tua* Ps. 112-113.

filio | meo te esse amicum et illum intellexi tibi (Capt. 140),  
 sine dispendio | tuo tuam libertam (Poen. 163),  
 servos . . . | suos mihi (Most. 1087).

If alliteration appears in such cases, it is, of course, incidental and results from the attraction: it is not a primary factor.

Wackernagel (Indog. Forsch. I, 406 ff.) does not include *meus*, *tuos*, *suos* among his examples of enclitic words that drift to the beginning of the sentence. There are cases of separation that might have been affected by his law, but they are too few to suggest the direct influence of his law; these few show the enclitic possessives immediately following the introductory word; they seem more significant when other words intervene between the possessive and the noun: e. g. Truc. 355, Aul. 733, St. 416. Since Wackernagel's law affects particularly certain monosyllabic and dissyllabic pronouns, it follows that in combination with the law of pronominal attraction there results in many cases the necessity of placing the possessive in the third or fourth place: take, for example, these two cases, one of separation, one without separation:

conteris  
 tu tua me oratione, mulier, quisquis es. (Cist. 609)

profecto nemo est quem iam dehinc metuum mihi  
 ne quid nocere possit, cum tu mihi tua  
 oratione omnem animum ostendisti tuum. (As. 111)

To say nothing of other features, the rule of collocation that makes *tu* second in the sentence, in combination with the attraction that joins *tu tua me* and *tu mihi tua*, undoubtedly regulates to a considerable degree the disposition of the words; and it is clear that the existence of such laws of collocation must appear seriously to interfere with the poet's consideration of verse-unity, at least in many cases.

Such laws affect the spoken language; if Plautus is more observant of them than of verse-unity, it is no more than we should expect of a dramatic poet who is reproducing the conversational Latin of his day. The same general truth applies to ordinary attributives, but they are not as a class subject to these particu-

lar regulations. In addition to the observance of laws controlling the arrangement of words in speech the poet is governed by the conditions of his verse. It is easy to overestimate the force of metrical convenience. It is seldom more than one of many factors. But it may hardly be denied that the iambic or pyrrhic possessives found a comfortable habitat at the end<sup>81</sup> and at the beginning of certain iambic and trochaic verses. Indeed, quite apart from the metrical convenience of the possessives that do not involve separation, the cases of separated possessives of iambic or pyrrhic measurement lead to two conclusions:

1) in all cases of separation in which *meus*, *tuos*, or *suos* follows a substantive, whether with or without intervening words, the possessive stands at the beginning of the second verse;<sup>82</sup>

2) in all cases of separation in which *meus*, *tuos*, or *suos* precedes a substantive, whether with or without intervening words, the possessive stands at the end of the first verse.<sup>83</sup>

The exceptions to these principles<sup>84</sup> only test their validity. It is of course evident that in the cases covered by the first rule there is no reason why the possessive should not stand at the end of the second verse; such a position is unusual, probably because the separation by intervening words is thereby abnormally great; an example from Terence is

qui tum illam amabant, forte ita ut fit, filium  
perduxere illuc, secum ut una esset, meum. (And. 80)

Similarly under the second rule there is no reason why the possessive should not stand at the beginning of the first verse; but here, again, such position is unusual probably because of the extent of the intervening words; an isolated example is

<sup>81</sup> For statistics cf. Nilsson, l. c. 37.

<sup>82</sup> Amph. 134, 135, As. 387, 434, Aul. 289, Bacch. 880, Capt. 141, 873, Cist. 586, 601, Cure. 347, 430, Ep. 391, 401, 482, 583, M. G. 543, Most. 638, 998, 1088, Poen. 164, 192, 1375, Ps. 483, 650, 850, Rud. 743, Trin. 1101, 1144, True. 293.

<sup>83</sup> As. 16, 112, 785, Aul. 733, Bacch. 406, 777, Cist. 184, 547, 772, Ep. 279, Men. 420, 480, 518, 740, M. G. 563, 635, 799, Rud. 1392, St. 416, Trin. 1147, True. 355.

<sup>84</sup> The hiatus, therefore, after the first word of Ps. 650 is not to be cured by changing *suam huc* to *huc suam* (Bothe), and Trin. 141 becomes suspicious.



meamne hic Mnesilochus, Nicobuli filius,  
per vim ut retineat mulierem? (Bacch. 842)

In both cases the rare position is attended by other features: in the first, the postponement of *meum* perhaps suggests the pathos of the situation; in the second, emphasis, alliteration, and collocation with *hic* are contributory factors. Finally, such an exception to these rules as appears in the following example is due to the peculiar nature of the formula and the greater convenience of *obsecro* at the end:

adsum, Calicles: per tua obsecro  
genua, ut tu istuc insipienter factum sapienter feras (True. 826)

Cf. Cure. 630, where *per tua genua te obsecro* concludes the verse, and Poen. [1387], where, again at the end of the verse, we find *per ego tua te genua obsecro*.<sup>85</sup>

We have thus noted several features that make the comparatively large number of separated possessives more easily understood. As in the case of ordinary attributives, there are occasionally special conditions which emphasize the unity of the verse in spite of the separation. The accidental alliteration arising from pronominal attraction we have already noticed, there are a few cases of genuine alliteration:

ubi erit empty, ut aliquo ex urbe amoveas; nisi quid est tua  
secus sententia. (Ep. 279)

nam hominem servom suos  
domitos habere oportet oculos et manus (M. G. 563)

oculos volo  
meos delectare munditiis meretriciis. (Poen. 191)

There are a few cases, allied to those of pronominal attraction, in which pronominal words are not immediately juxtaposed but are grouped together in the same verse:

ah, salus  
mea, servavisti me. (Bacch. 879)

vel ego, qui dudum fili causa coeperam  
ego me exerceare animi, quasi quid filius

<sup>85</sup> Cf. Langen, Beiträge zur Kritik u. Erklärung d. Pl. 335; Kämpf, l. c. 21.

meus deliquisset me erga (Ep. 389)<sup>86</sup>

o filia

mea, quom hanc video, mearum me absens miseriarum communes; (Rud. 742)

In the following example *meae* belongs to both nouns:

inseitiæ

meae et stultitiæ ignosceas. (M. G. 542)

The possessive adjectives of the plural pronouns of the first and second persons occur naturally with much less frequency than *meus*, *tuos*, *suos*, and cases of separation are proportionately fewer. They are subject to fewer special regulations and conditions: they are not enclitics; metrical convenience does not affect their position so significantly; they are to be sure subject to the principle of pronominal attraction:<sup>87</sup>

saluto te, vicine Apollo, qui aedibus

propinquos nostris accolis, venerorque te, (Bacch. 172)

tonstricem Suram

novisti nostram? (Truc. 405)

qua re filiam

credidisti nostram? (Ep. 597)

meritissimo eius quæ volet faciemus, qui hosce amores  
nostros dispulsos compulit. (As. 737)

nam meus formidat animus, nostrum tam diu

ibi desiderare neque redire filium. (Bacch. 237)

In these cases there is little to suggest the entity of individual verses. The possessive and its noun in every example but one bracket other words, and the word-group thus formed shows no respect for verse-unity. Such word-groups appear in very simple form in Altenberg's examples from early prose: in Plautus's verse—we may not here enquire into the causes—they are often

<sup>86</sup> Note also *ego*, *ego me*, *meus* at or near the beginning of successive verses.

<sup>87</sup> This does not happen to appear in our examples, but note Terence Haut. 711:

ut quom narret senex

voster nostro esse istam amicam gnati, non credat tamen.

elaborate, as the last example above illustrates.<sup>88</sup> The significant fact is that in spite of the employment of such interlocked phrases the poet so seldom allows them to escape into the second verse. It is true that when the ordinary attributive escapes, verse-unity seems more often to reassert itself than when a possessive is separated, but such difference as there is, is accounted for by the relative frequency of the possessives, the unemphatic nature of most of them, and their metrical character, which draws some of them to the extremities of the verse. Inasmuch as *noster*, *voster* are subject only to the second of these influences, lack of emphasis may properly be regarded as the most important factor in the separation.<sup>89</sup>

<sup>88</sup> In the cases of *meus*, *tuos*, *suos*, usually the possessive is separated from its noun only by a verb (Aul. 733-734, Pls. 849-850). There are a few cases of more elaborate interlocking:

ad illum quae tuum  
perdidit, pessum dedit tibi filium unice unicum. (Bacch. 406)

Special effects are usually produced by such arrangements; an interesting case is

sicut tuum vis unicum gnatum tuae  
superesse vitae sospitem et superstitem, (As. 16)

Here the couplet is securely linked together by the connection between the noun of the first verse and the adjectives of the second; but as the connection is predicative, the unity of the second verse, reinforced by the sound- and sense-effect, is paramount; *tuae* is separated from *vitalae*, and the separation also divides the group *tuae superesse vitae*, but if our conclusions above are correct, the weak force of *tuae* made the separation inoffensive to the Roman. Another interesting case is

quid ais? cequam scis filium tibicinam  
meum amare? (Ps. 482)

The criss-cross *cequam* . . . *filium tibicinam* | *meum* brings together the contrasted objects and suggests the father's indignation, while *meum* is too weak to interrupt seriously the unity of the verses except so far as it is already interrupted.

<sup>89</sup> The evidence does not suffice to include Greek influence as an additional factor. The ways of expressing the possessive idea in Greek are more varied, and the conditions inherent in the words are different from those of their Latin equivalents. The fragments of the New Comedy offer almost no parallels to the separation in Plautus. In Menander's (307 K.) τὸ γυνῶνι σαρτὸν ἐστίν, ἂν τὰ πράγματα | εἰδῆς τὰ σαρτοῦ, the article with the pos-

## V.

These special conditions also affect many other pronominal adjectives, so that it is not surprising that, for example, the demonstrative pronouns in their adjectival usage are second, in frequency of separation, to the possessive adjectives. Again, however, the cases of separation, viewed with reference to the total number of occurrences of such adjectives, are extremely few. The fact that these words are pronominal as well as adjectival may in many cases have mitigated the separation; and the effect of Wackernagel's law and of the law of pronominal attraction, working either separately or in common, is very pronounced in many of our examples. The studies of Langen, Baeh, Kämpf, Kellerhof, taken in connection with Wackernagel's different and broader point of view, explain the position not only of the demonstratives, but of the determinative, and of the indefinite *quis* and its derivatives. If these words find their natural habitat immediately after the introductory word of the sentence, and if the closeness of the adjectival relation is something much less binding than the operation of Wackernagel's law—as is quite evident—it is remarkable that cases of separation are so infrequent.

The examples that follow will show the pronominal word in close connection with the introductory word of the sentence; so *nunc* is immediately followed by *hoc*:

nunc hoc deferam

argentum ad hanc, quam mage amo quam matrem meam. (True. 661)

sessive genitive may suggest an amplifying idea. I have not found any cases of *ἐμός*, *σός* thus separated. In Euripides, however, parallels occur, but they are less frequent than in Plautus; e. g. γήμας τύραννον καὶ κασιγνήτους τέκνους | ἐμοῖς φυτεύων; (Med. 877, possibly with emphasis on *ἐμοῖς*), τήνδ' ἐμὴν κομίζομαι | λαβὼν ἀδελφὴν (Iph. T. 1362), οὐχὶ τήν ἐμὴν | φονέα νομίζων χεῖρα (Iph. T. 585), ἵτωσαν εἰς σὴν σὸν θεοῖς ἀγῶματι | γαῖαν (Iph. T. 1480). So, too, σὸν . . . | πρόσσωπον (Ion 925), πατρός | τοῖμοῦ (Ion 725, Med. 746), φρένας | τᾶς σᾶς (Ion 1271), τέκνα . . . | τὰμ' (Med. 792), τοῖσι σοῖς ἐναντίον | λόγῳσιν (Med. 1132). On the whole, inherent features of the Latin words are more likely to have been the dominant influences, although the agreement points to an inherited separability.

nomen Trinummo fecit. nunc hoc vos<sup>90</sup> rogat  
ut liceat possidere hanc nomen fabulam. (Trin. 20)<sup>91</sup>

In close association with *qui* or with *si*:

nam servom misi qui illum<sup>92</sup> sectari solet  
meum gnatum: is ipse hanc destinavit fidicinam. (Ep. 486)  
hi qui illum dudum conciliaverunt mihi  
peregrinum Spartaem, (Poen. 769)  
nimis ceastor facinus mirum est, qui illi conlibitum siet  
meo viro sie me insimulare falso facinus tam malum. (Amph. 858)

qui ad illum deferat  
meum erum, qui Athenis fuerat, qui hanc amaverat, (M. G. 131)  
ut si illie coneriminatus sit advorsum militem  
meus conservos, eam vidisse hic eum alieno oscularier, (M. G. 242)

nam si ille argentum prius  
hospes huc affert, continuo nos ambo exclusi sumus. (As. 360)  
edepol ne illie pulehram praedam agat, si quis illam invenerit  
aulam onustam auri; (Aul. 610)<sup>93</sup>  
di tibi propitii sunt, nam herele si istam semel amiseris  
libertatem, haud facile in eundem rusum restitues locum. (M. G. 701)

The regularity with which the separated noun in these and many other cases stands at the beginning of the second verse, with many words intervening between it and the pronominal adjective—a mystery followed by its solution—conveys the effect of a personal pronoun and an appositive—"him . . . my son," etc. Such interpretation may be purely subjective,<sup>94</sup> but in any case

<sup>90</sup> But A reads *vos hoc*.

<sup>91</sup> On this verse cf. Leo, Bemerkungen über plautinische Wortstellung u. Wortgruppen 430.

<sup>92</sup> *illum qui* P.

<sup>93</sup> Features reinforcing the unity of the verse are apparent in the previous example (*hospes huc*), and here particularly where *aulam onustam auri* are undoubtedly linked together by a unity of sound-effect: cf. Aul. 763, 617, 709, 809, 821.

<sup>94</sup> Cf. Appuhn, l. c. 59. In a case like the following, the noun with its relative clause in the second verse seems to intensify the substantival effect of the demonstrative in the first verse:

"quam facile et quam fortunate evenit illi, obseero,  
mulieri quam liberare volt amator." (Ep. 243)

Occasionally this effect is brought out explicitly:

em istie homo te articulatim concidit, senex,  
tuos servos. (Ep. 488)



the rather constant attraction of these pronominal words to the second place in the sentence, without regard to any association with the noun, was certainly the usage of the spoken language; it is, therefore, unlikely that there was any violence in the separation by the verse comparable to the division in English of "that . . . son of mine." Many pronominal adjectives seem to have an independent force, a closer affinity with other words than with their substantives: in any consideration of verse-unity they are almost non-existent.

In isolated cases the separated demonstrative appears in company with *nam* and *quid*; the indefinite *quis* and its derivatives are similarly connected with the introductory particle rather than with the noun:

nam is illius filiam  
coniecit in navem miles clam matrem suam, (M. G. 111)

quid hic<sup>95</sup> non poterat de suo  
senex obsonari filiai nuptiis? (Aul. 294)

sed speculabor ne quis aut hinc aut ab laeva aut dextera  
nostro consilio venator adsit cum auritis plagis. (M. G. 607)

nam cogitato, si quis hoc gnato tuo  
tuos servos faxit, qualem haberes gratiam? (Capt. 711)

nescio quid istuc negoti dicam, nisi si quispiam<sup>96</sup> est  
Amphitruo alius, (Amph. 825)

ibo in Piraeum, visam eequae advenerit  
in portum ex Epheso navis mercatoria. (Baech. 235)

eequem  
reecalvom ad Silanum senem, statutum, ventriosum, (Rud. 316)

Some examples have already illustrated the juxtaposition of pronominal words; in the following case (a lyrical passage) particles and pronouns are grouped together in a way that readers of Plautus will admit to be almost inevitable: if there is any violence in the separation of *istam*—which I doubt—it is easily

<sup>95</sup> Usually punctuated—*quid? hic* etc., but unnecessarily, I think; in any case the stress is on *quid*, and *hic* is not the first word of the sentence-unit, as the metre shows.

<sup>96</sup> There is, however, nothing regular in the collocation *si quispiam*: see the examples in Prehn, *Quaestiones Plautinae de pronomibus indefinitis* 7-8.

forgiven for the sake of *secelestam*, *seclus*, *linguam* and the division only brings into relief that phrase:

quid est? quo modo? iam quidem hercle ego tibi istam  
secelestam, seclus, linguam abseidam. (Amph. 556)

There are other examples of the demonstrative which have none of the attendant features illustrated above, but which for other reasons are hardly to be considered as disturbing the unity of the verse. Among these is a small group of cases in which the noun is in the first verse, and the demonstrative in the second verse is defined in a relative clause; thus the second verse simply amplifies the meaning of the noun in the first verse:

‘immo apud trapezitam situm est  
illum quem dixi Lyconem,’ (Cure. 345)

continuo arbitretur uxor tuo gnato atque ut fideinam  
illam quam is volt liberare, quae illum corrumpit tibi,  
ulciscare atque ita curetur, usque ad mortem ut serviat. (Ep. 267)

oboluit marsupium  
huic istuc quod habes. (Men. 384)

So, too, with *idem*:

duxit uxorem hic sibi  
eandem quam olim virginem hic compresserat, (Cist. 177)

There is, of course, no more separation in these cases than in<sup>97</sup>

sed optume ecceum ipse advenit  
hospes ille, qui has tabellas attulit. (Pers. 543)

According to the earlier punctuation with a comma after *singularias*, the following verses would not concern us:

eis indito catenas singulares  
istas, maiores quibus sunt iuncti demito. (Capt. 112)

But Bach (Studemund-Stud. II 322) offers valid reasons for referring *istas* to the previous verse; such a separation is difficult to parallel, and Bach's examples are wide of the mark. There is, to be sure, a contrast suggested by the juxtaposition

---

<sup>97</sup> Or in

quid ais? tu nunc si forte eumpse Charmidem conspexeris  
illum quem tibi istas dedisse commemoras epistulas, (Trin. 950)

of *istas* and *maiores*, which may account for the separation, but it is certainly very vaguely suggested; the demonstrative, if it follows the noun and is in the second verse, is usually attended by features that more evidently justify separation:

quis istuc quaeso? an ille quasi ego?—is ipse quasi tu. (tum) senex  
ille quasi ego “ si vis,” inquit “ quattuor sane dato ” (St. 552)<sup>98</sup>

ei rei dies  
haec praestituta est, proxuma Dionysia?  
eras ea quidem sunt. (Ps. 58)

tu abduc hosce intro et una nutricem simul  
iube hanc abire hinc ad te. (Poen. 1147)

qua pro re argentum promisit hic tibi?—si vidulum  
hunc redegissem in potestatem eius, iuratus dare  
mibi talentum magnum argenti. (Rud. 1378)

Such analogies as there are to *istas* according to Bach's punctuation must be found in these examples: the contrast in *ille . . . ego, haec . . . cras*,<sup>99</sup> and the resumptive force of *hanc* and its proximity to *hinc*—all these features reinforce the unity of the verses; it may be doubted whether in the last example *hunc . . . eius* is a feature that has any bearing upon the separation of *hunc*: it is an unusual example (cf. Trin. 1123–4 according to Lindsay's Oxford text), and the nearest parallel to Bach's *istas* that I have found.

A few examples do not admit of grouping under characteristics common to any large number of cases:<sup>100</sup>

postremo, si dietis nequis perducitur vera haec credas  
mea dieta, ex factis nosce rem. (Most. 198)

haec sunt atque aliae multae in magnis dotibus  
incommoditates sumptusque intolerabiles. (Aul. 532)

an te ibi vis inter istas vorsarier  
prosedas, pistorum amicas, (Poen. 265)

<sup>98</sup> The whole context should be read to get the play on *quasi ego* and *quasi tu*.

<sup>99</sup> Contrast with this verse a later reference in the same play:

nam olim quom abiit, argento haec dies  
praestitutast, quoad referret nobis, neque dum rettulit. (Ps. 623)

<sup>100</sup> Most. 618 should be included, if Leo's supplementary readings are correct.

mulier profecto natast ex ipsa Mora;  
nam quaevis alia quae morast aequae, mora  
minor ea videtur quam quae propter mulieremst. (M. G. 1292)

pro di immortales, similiorem mulierem  
magisque eandem, ut pote quae non sit eadem, (M. G. 528)

In none of these is the separation violent; effective antithesis, long words grouped in one verse, alliteration, the combination of associated ideas—*ca . . . quae propter mulieremst*,<sup>101</sup> *eandem . . . eadem*—are compensating features, all of which testify to the individuality of the verse.

The freedom with which the relative is separated from its noun in Oscan and Umbrian (Norden, *Kunstprosa* I 181 n.; Altenburg, *De sermone pedestri Italarum vetustissimo* 530) suggests that the relative adjective has an inherent separability; and in several of the cases there is some evidence of unity despite the separation:

nimis paene manest.—mane quod tu oceperis  
negotium agere, id totum procedit diem. (Pers. 114)

ut in tabellis quos consignavi hic heri  
latrones, ibus denumerem stipendium. (M. G. 73)

cui servitutem di danunt lenoniam  
puero, atque eidem si addunt turpitudinem, (Ps. 767)

ita ut ocepi dicere, illum quem dudum (e fano foras)  
lenonem extrusisti, hic eius vidulum ecce illum (tenet). (Rud. 1065)

di illum infelice omnes, qui post hunc diem  
leno ullam Veneri unquam immolarit hostiam, (Poen. 449)

qui hic litem apisci postulant peiurio  
mali, res falsas qui impetrant apud iudicem, (Rud. 17)

quin tu tuam rem cura potius quam Seleuci, quae tibi  
condicio nova et luculenta fertur per me interpretem. (M. G. 951)

ni hercle diffregeritis talos posthac quemque in tegulis  
videritis alienum,<sup>102</sup> (M. G. 156)

qui omnes se amare credit, quaeque aspexerit  
mulier:<sup>103</sup> eum oderunt qua viri qua mulieres. (M. G. 1391)

<sup>101</sup> This does not exhaust the effects: note *mora* at the ends of successive verses; and *mora* at the end of the second verse may be in close relation with *quaevis alia* of its own verse as well as with the next verse.

<sup>102</sup> Similarly, but without separation by the verse in

quemque a milite hoc videritis hominem in nostris tegulis, (M. G. 160)

<sup>103</sup> *Mulierem* B, *mulieres eum* CD.

The uniformity with which the separated substantive stands at the beginning of the second verse is rather striking: the mystery suggested by the anticipatory relatives makes its solution worthy of a prominent position; the resumptive pronoun in many cases makes the noun at home in its verse in spite of separation—*negotium . . . id, latrones . . . ibus, puero . . . eidem, lenonem . . . eius*; other evidence of unity is visible in the fact that *mali* (Rud. 18) belongs as much with the *qui* of its own verse as with the *qui* of the preceding verse,<sup>104</sup> and in the echo *mulier . . . mulieres* (M. G. 1392).<sup>105</sup>

Occasionally the interrogative adjective is similarly separated:

quem amplexa sum  
hominem? (M. G. 1345)

enia ad aures  
vox mi advolavit? (Rud. 332)<sup>106</sup>

The indefinite adjectives, too, now and then appear in verses by themselves; such a separation of *nescio quis* from its noun hardly impairs verse-unity;<sup>107</sup> and cases of *aliquis* and *quisquam*,<sup>108</sup> by the very nature of the words, are inoffensive:

nam sibi laudavisse hasee ait architeetone  
nescio quem exaedificatas insanum bene. (Most. 760)

atque ego illi aspicio osculantem Philocomasium cum altero  
nescio quo adulescente. (M. G. 288)

si censes, coquam  
aliquem arripiamus, prandium qui percoquat (Mere. 579)

ego si allegavissem aliquem ad hoc negotium  
minus hominem doctum minusque ad hanc rem callidum, (Ep. 427)

<sup>104</sup> Cf. Leo, *Analeeta Plautina: de figuris sermonis* I 20. The position of *mali* (18) and *bonos* (21), each at the beginning of its verse, brings out the contrast.

<sup>105</sup> For the repetition of *mulier* cf.

ecce ad me advenit  
mulier, qua mulier alia nullast pulchrior: (Mere. 100)

<sup>106</sup> *Cui* MSS. But the same or similar phrases usually occur without separation: Trin. 45, Cure. 229, Mere. 864.

<sup>107</sup> Cf. Ter. Ad. 657-658.

<sup>108</sup> Cf. Ter. Ad. 716-717.



peiores ego hominem magisque vorsute malum  
numquam edepol quemquam vidi quam hic est Simia; (Ps. 1017)

neque ego taetriorem beluam  
vidisse me unquam quemquam quam te censeo. (Most. 607)

There are some noteworthy features: the balanced alliteration in Merc. 579-580; in Ep. 427 *aliquem* is really substantial, "somebody else," and the next verse a separable element; in the two cases of *quisquam*, the regular juxtaposition of words ending in *-quam* is illustrated.<sup>109</sup>

*Alter*,<sup>110</sup> when separated, is in effect an added idea:

at ego nunc, Amphitruo, dico: Sosiam servum tuum  
praeter me alterum, inquam, adveniens faciam ut offendas domi, (Amph. 612)

echo tu, quam vos igitur filiam  
nunc quaeritis alteram? (Cist. 602)

The separation of *alterum* from *tantum* in the following couplet (omitted in A) is more violent: cf. the same phrase within the verse in Bacch. 1184, an anapestic passage, and in frag. 4 of the Caecus:

immo etiam si alterum  
tantum perdundumst, perdam potius quam sinam (Ep. 518)

So in this case of *tantulum*:

immo, Chrysale, em non tantulum  
unquam intermittit tempus quin eum nominet. (Bacch. 209)

It would be difficult to prove that any emphasis is attained by the position of these etic words at the end of the verse and by their separation from the substantives, but the context in each case suggests considerable emphasis upon the adjectives.<sup>111</sup>

<sup>109</sup> This hardly needs further evidence, but to quote only one play, cf. Men. 192, 400, 447, 518, 613, 780, 959.

<sup>110</sup> Cf. the separation of *alius* in St. 449-450; Ter. And. 778-779 (*alia aliam*), Hee. 365-366, Ad. 52-53, in the last two cases preceding the noun.

<sup>111</sup> The inherent separability of these pronominal adjectives is confirmed by the same phenomena in Greek: cf. above, p. 215, and for the demonstratives Menander 567; Philemon 7; 58; Diphilus 30; 3; for *αὐτός* Menander 117-118; 580; 748; for *τις* Menander 325, 8; for *ὅστις* Menander 393; for *ποσάῃτα* Menander 140; for *ἄλλος* Menander 535, 3.

## VI.

The numerals, also, have an independent existence which may account for the cases of separation by the verse-end:

seelestiorem ego annum argento faenori .  
numquam ullum vidi quam hic mihi annus optigit. (Most. 532)

verbum  
nullum<sup>112</sup> fecit. (Bacch. 982)

ferat epistulas  
duas, eas nos consignemus, quasi sint a patre: (Trin. 774)  
ei filiae  
duae erant, quasi nunc meae sunt; eae erant duobus nuptae fratribus,  
quasi nunc meae sunt vobis. (St. 539)

Alexandrum magnum atque Agathoclem aiunt maxumas  
duo res gessisse: quid mihi fiet tertio,  
qui solus facio facinora immortalia. (Most. 775)

hic dico, in fanum Veneris qui mulierculas  
duas secum adduxit, (Rud. 128)

ocepere aliae mulieres  
duae post me sic fabulari inter sese (Ep. 236)

mulieres  
duae innocentes intus hic sunt, tui indigentes auxili, (Rud. 641)

quia vos in patriam domum  
reliisse video bene gesta re ambos, te et fratrem tuum. (St. 506)

tum captivorum quid ducunt secum! pueros, virgines,  
binos, ternos, alius quinque; (Ep. 210)

ubi saepe causam dixeris pendens advorsus octo  
artutos, audacis viros, valentis virgatores. (As. 564)

ubi saepe ad languorem tua duritia dederis octo  
validos lictores, ulmeis adfectos lentis virgis. (As. 574)

(atque) auditavi saepe hoc volgo dicier,  
solere elephantum gravidam perpetuos decem  
esse annos; (St. 167)

non quinquaginta modo,  
quadringentos filios habet atque equidem lectos sine probro: (Bacch. 973)

<sup>112</sup> *Verbum nullum* without separation by the verse in Bacch. 785 (by emendation), Ter. Eun. 88. *Ullus*, with *neque* preceding, is separated in Ter. Ad. 85.

The last passage is from a canticum, and is ascribed by Leo to an amplifier. In the other examples some attendant features are worth noting. Respect for unity is shown in *duae—duobus* (St. 539), *duo—tertio* (Most. 775),<sup>113</sup> and in the isolation of adjectives and nouns in the second verse in the two examples from the *Asinaria*. In most of the cases the numeral follows the noun, or if it precedes the separation brings into prominence important elements (As. 564, 574, St. 168). A few cases of *omnes* are in place here:<sup>114</sup>

hariolos, haruspices

mitte omnes; (Amph. 1132)

quin edepol servos, ancillas domo  
certum est omnis mittere ad te. (Cas. 521)

deartuasti dilaceravisti atque opes  
confecisti omnes, res ac rationes meas: (Capt. 672 ap. Nonium)

ita res divina mihi fuit: res serias  
omnis extollo ex hoc die in alium diem. (Poen. 499)

Rhodium venimus, ubi quas merees vexeram  
omnis ut volui vendidi ex sententia: (Mere. 93)

servos pollicitust dare

suos mihi omnis quaestioni. (Most. 1087)

ubi ego omnibus

parvis magnisque miseriis praefuleior: (Ps. 771)

atque me minoris facio prae illo, qui omnium  
legum atque iurum fietor, conditor eluet; (Ep. 522)

fateor me omnium

hominum esse Athenis Atticis minimi preti. (Ep. 501)

The first six examples, in which the adjective follows in the second verse, involve no violation of verse-unity: the last three, however, are certainly, from an English standpoint, more destructive of unity. (Cf. also the separation of *tot* in Poen. 582.) It is likely that the adjective is more separable than the corresponding word in English: the evidence for this is found in the apparent separability of numerals in general, and

<sup>113</sup> Cf. Poen. 898.

<sup>114</sup> For *omnes* in Ter. cf. And. 77, 667, Eun. 1032. Similarly *complures*, Ter. Ad. 229 (cf. *plurimi* in Plautus, above, p. 237); *pauci*, Ter. Hee. 58; *aliquod*, Ter. Phor. 312. Cf. Norden, *Aeneis* Buch VI, 390.

in the usage of the corresponding words in Greek verse.<sup>115</sup> Certainly the explanation of the separation of numerals is more likely to be found in inherent qualities of the numerals as such than in such attendant features as the metrical convenience of the cretic *omnium* at the end of a verse.

## VII.

Proper and improper numerals, pronominal adjectives, and in particular possessive adjectives were separated without essential disturbance of verse-unity. This inherent separability seems to be proved not only by the treatment of these words in Plautus, but by the evidence furnished by early Latin prose, and by Greek prose and verse: the nature of the evidence suggests that this separability was an inherited trait. The operation of Wackernagel's law and of the law of pronominal attraction is a further manifestation of the looseness of the bond that binds pronominal adjectives to their nouns. The separation of possessive adjectives was probably promoted by the unemphatic nature of the words, which suffered a loss of their individuality. These conclusions do not differ essentially from those of Appuhn.

In the treatment of attributive adjectives, however, I hope that something has been gained by an attempt to interpret, within the limits set by the paper, the passages illustrating separation. We found that attributives following the noun and separated were regularly expressions of ideas ranging from predicative to amplifying, and the separation was usually attended by features that reinforced the unity of the verse. We found, too, that when the separated attributives preceded their nouns, although from an English standpoint the unity of the verse was

<sup>115</sup> For the ordinary numerals in Ter. cf. Eun. 332, Phor. 638, Ad. 46. For Greek examples cf. *εἷς*, *οὐδέεις*, *μῆδεεις*, Menander 535, 3; 282; 382; 397; 128, 3; Philemon 4, 13; 28, 9; other numerals, Menander 7, 1; 357; 547-548; Philemon 12; 89, 7; *πᾶς*, Menander 13, 2; 173; *ὅλος*, Menander 67, 2; *πάντες*, *ἅπαντες*, Diphilus 17, 2; Philemon 91, 7; Menander 292, 4; 363, 7; 404, 7; 532, 1; *πολλὰ*, Menander 593. And for numerals in early Latin prose, cf. Altenburg, l. c. 524 ff.

impaired, there were almost always associations of sound or sense that reasserted the unity of the verse; more often the unity was apparent in the organization of the thought than in the superficial colligation resulting from sound-effects.

We may not always be confident that the resultant effects represent efficient causes: in the matter of alliteration this is especially true. The confinement, in most cases, of alliterative groups to a single verse attests the entity of the verse, but alliteration is seldom more than an incidental factor in separation: usually other and stronger factors appear along with alliteration.

Metrical convenience is evident in the position of some words, especially those of considerable length, cretic words, and the possessive adjectives of pyrrhic and iambic measurement: the position convenient for such words may have conduced to separation. Again, however, other factors are usually discernible.

Indeed, the total effect of a verse or couplet is a product of many factors: it is not easy to say that one is more important than another. But it seems to me noteworthy that in so large a number of separated attributives, the unity of the verse, if my interpretation is correct, is effected by internal organization rather than by superficial colligation. So much so that in cases like *maximo | me opsecravisti opere, optima | vos video opportunitate, tesscrum | conferre si vis hospitalem* I prefer to recognize the beginnings of a freer technique rather than admit metrical convenience and alliteration as really dominant factors in the separation.

Such cases are rare; nor may anybody deny the essential unity of verse, the practical identity of verse and thought, in the examples under discussion. The effect is often crudely simple, but in many cases the poet is far from being a clumsy craftsman; he shows no little competency in making verse-unity a means of bringing into effective relief associated thoughts and sounds; and occasionally he uses the beginning and the end of the same verse, the beginnings of successive verses, in ways that indicate a consciousness of the opportunities, not merely of the limitations, presented by verse-unity.

It is also significant that we can find so little positive proof of



the influence of his Greek sources:<sup>116</sup> he seems rather to be working out his own problems in the spirit of his own language, fashioning his verse with nice adjustment of sound-effects peculiar to Latin, often producing a neat balance or antithesis which has yet to be proved to result from a study of Greek rhetoric, and happily conserving, even within the limits set by verse-unity, the simpler forms of interlocked word-groups, which are as characteristic of the organizing power of the Roman mind as any phase of their political administration. These same word-groups, however, must sometimes break down the barriers, and *maxumo* | *me opsecravisti opere, optuma* | *vos video opportunitate, tesseram* | *conferre si vis hospitalem* perhaps point the way which leads to greater freedom.

Only after further investigation is it safe to take the historical point of view and ask ourselves what is Plautus's precise position in the development of verse-technique. In the answer to that question we must not be too hasty in placing him near the beginning of art-poetry in Latin: the comic verse under discussion is the most capacious of the commoner forms of metre; and this verse conveyed the conversational Latin of the day to an audience that must catch at once the effects of sound and thought. Epic verse and tragedy were created under different conditions. Some of the simple directness of Plautus's verse is perhaps to be attributed to these conditions rather than to the chronological proximity of the Saturnian verse. But in the present paper we have been interested only in suggesting some

<sup>116</sup> Without further investigation of Greek technique the statement must remain in this vague form. It would be easy to find parallels from Euripides, and some cases from the New Comedy, of Plautus's postponement of adjectives and nouns to the beginning of the second verse, and of postponement for antithetical effects, but the running over of the thought to the caesura of the second verse, familiar to readers of Greek tragic poetry, is the exception rather than the rule in Plautus; nor are the features common to Greek and Plautine verse too hastily to be regarded as merely imitative in Latin verse, especially in the case of antithetical effects. Investigation, particularly of the technique of Aristophanes, Euripides, and the New Comedy, based upon sympathetic interpretation, must precede any more precise statement of Plautus's relation to his models in these respects.

ways of interpreting a small part of the evidence that bears upon the question which Leo has answered, forestalling the investigation of the subject in his admirable statement of the historical position of Plautus in this phase of verse-technique.





UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PUBLICATIONS—(CONTINUED)

**ANTHROPOLOGICAL MEMOIRS.** (Quarto).

- Vol. I. Explorations in Peru, by Max Uhle (in preparation).  
 No. 1. The Ruins of Moche.  
 No. 2. Huamachuco, Chincha, Ica.  
 No. 3. The Inca Buildings of the Valley of Pisco.

**ASTRONOMY.**—W. W. Campbell, Editor. (Lick Observatory, Mt. Hamilton, Cal.)

Publications of the Lick Observatory.—Volumes I-V completed. Volume VI (in progress).

- No. 1. A Short Method of Determining Orbits from Three Observations, by A. O. Leuschner.  
 No. 2. Elements of Asteroid 1900 GA, by A. O. Leuschner and Adelaide M. Hobe.  
 No. 3. Preliminary Elements of Comet 1900 III, by R. H. Curtiss and C. G. Dall.

Contributions from the Lick Observatory.—Nos. I-V.

Lick Observatory Bulletins.—Volumes I-III completed. Volume IV (in progress).

**BOTANY.**—W. A. Setchell, Editor. Price per volume \$3.50. Volume I (pp. 418) completed. Volume II (in progress).

- |   |                         |
|---|-------------------------|
| No. 8. The Resistance of Certain Marine Algæ to Changes in Osmotic Pressure and Temperature, by W. J. V. Osterhout. | In one cover. Price .25 |
| No. 9. The Rôle of Osmotic Pressure in Marine Plants, by W. J. V. Osterhout.  |                         |
| No. 10. On the Importance of Physiologically Balanced Solutions for Plants, by W. J. V. Osterhout.                  |                         |
| No. 11. The Antitoxic Action of Potassium on Magnesium, by W. J. V. Osterhout.                                      |                         |
| No. 12. Cytological Studies in Cyanophyceae, by Nathaniel Lyon Gardner.   | Price, 1.00             |
| No. 13. On a small Collection of Mosses from Alaska, by J. Cardot and T. Thériot                                    | Price, .10              |

**EDUCATION.**—Edited by the Department of Education. Price per volume \$2.50.

- Volume I (pp. 424). Notes on the Development of a Child, by Millicent W. Shinn. Price, 2.25  
 Vol. II (in progress).—No. 1. Notes on Children's Drawings, by Elmer E. Brown. Price, .50  
 Vol. III (in progress).—No. 1. Origin of American State Universities, by Elmer E. Brown. Price, .50  
 No. 2. State Aid to Secondary Schools, by David Rhys Jones. Price, .75

**ENGINEERING.**—Edited under the direction of the Engineering Departments. This series will contain contributions from the Colleges of Mechanics, Mining, and Civil Engineering. Volume I in progress.

- No. 1. Bulletin of the Department of Civil Engineering. I.—Moment Diagrams and Typical Live Loads, by Charles Derleth, Jr., Pages 1-9, Plate 1. January, 1907. Price, .10

**GEOLOGY.**—Bulletin of the Department of Geology. Andrew C. Lawson, Editor. Price per volume \$3.50. Volumes I (pp. 428), II (pp. 450), III (475) and IV (462), completed. Volume V (in progress).

4. New Cestracion Teeth from the West American Triassic, by Edna M. Wemple. Price, .10  
 5. Preliminary Note on a New Marine Reptile from the Middle Triassic of Nevada, by John C. Merriam. Price, .10  
 6. Lawsonite, Columbite, Beryl, Barite, and Calcite, by Arthur S. Eakle. Pp. 81-94, pl. 10. January, 1907. Price, .10  
 7. The Fossil Fishes of California, with Supplementary Notes on other Species of Extinct Fishes, by David Starr Jordan. Pp. 95-144, pls. 11-12. April, 1907. Price, .50  
 8. Fish Remains from the Marine Lower Triassic of Aspen Ridge, Idaho, by Malcolm Goddard. Pp. 145-148, June, 1907. Price, .05



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PUBLICATIONS—(CONTINUED)

**PATHOLOGY.**—Alonzo Englebert Taylor, Editor. Price per volume, \$2.50.  
Volume I (pp. 347) completed.

- |        |   |   |
|--------|---|---|
| No. 5. | On the Autolysis of Protein, by Alonzo Englebert Taylor.                                      | } In<br>one<br>cover<br>.25<br>.20<br>2.00<br>.05 |
| No. 6. | On the Reversion of Tryptic Digestion, by Alonzo Englebert Taylor.                            |   |
| No. 7. | Studies on an Ash-Free Diet, by Alonzo Englebert Taylor. Price,                               |   |
| No. 8. | On Fermentation, by Alonzo Englebert Taylor. Price,   |   |
| No. 9. | On the Synthesis of Protein through the Action of Trypsin, by Alonzo Englebert Taylor. Price, | .05   |

**PHILOSOPHY.**—Volume I, completed. Price, \$2.00.

**PHYSIOLOGY.**—Jacques Loeb, Editor. Price per volume \$2.00. Volume I (pp. 217) completed. Volume II (pp. 215) completed. Volume III (in progress).

- No. 7. On the Counteraction of the Toxic Effect of Hypertonic Solutions upon the Fertilized and Unfertilized Egg of the Sea-Urchin by Lack of Oxygen, by Jacques Loeb.
- No. 8. On the Production of a Fertilization Membrane in the Egg of the Sea-Urchin with the Blood of Certain Gephyrean Worms (a preliminary note), by Jacques Loeb.
- No. 9. Note on the Synthesis of Protein through the Action of Pepsin, by T. Brailsford Robertson.
- John Bruce MacCallum: On the Mechanism of the Physiological Action of the Cathartics. Price, 75c.

**ZOOLOGY.**—W. E. Ritter, Editor. Price per volume \$3.50. Volumes I (pp. 317) and II (pp. 382) completed. Volume III (in progress). Commencing with Volume II, this series contains Contributions from the Laboratory of the Marine Biological Association of San Diego.

- |         |  |                                       |
|---------|--|---------------------------------------|
| No. 6.  | Dinoflagellata of the San Diego Region, II. On <i>Tripodosolenia</i> , a New Genus of the Dinophysidae, by Charles Atwood Kofoid. Pages 24, Plates 3.  | } In<br>one<br>cover.<br>Price<br>.35 |
| No. 7.  | A Discussion of the Species Characters in <i>Tripodosolenia</i> , by Charles Atwood Kofoid. Pages 10.  |                                       |
| No. 8.  | On the Significance of the Asymmetry in <i>Tripodosolenia</i> , by Charles Atwood Kofoid; Pages 7.   |                                       |
| No. 9.  | Ostracoda of the San Diego Region. II.—Littoral Forms, by Chancey Juday. Pages 22, Pls. 3.   | } In<br>one<br>cover.<br>Price<br>.25 |
| No. 10. | Cladocera of the San Diego Region, by Chancey Juday. Pages 2; text-figure 1.   |                                       |
| No. 11. | The Marine Fishes of Southern California, by Edwin Chapin Starks and Earl Leonard Morris. Pages 93, Plate 1. Price,                                    | .75                                   |
| No. 12. | Biological Studies on <i>Corymorpha</i> . II.—The Development of <i>C. palma</i> from the Egg, by Harry Beal Torrey. Pages 46, 33 text figures. Price, | .50                                   |
| No. 13. | Dinoflagellata of the San Diego Region, III. Description of New Species, by Charles Atwood Kofoid. Pages 42, Plates 12. Price,                         | .50                                   |

**UNIVERSITY CHRONICLE.**—An official record of University life, issued quarterly, edited by a committee of the faculty. Price, \$1.00 per year. Current volume No. IX.

Address all orders, or requests for information concerning the above publications to **The University Press, Berkeley, California.**

European agent for the series in American Archaeology and Ethnology, Classical Philology, Education, Philosophy, and Semitic Philology, **Otto Harrassowitz, Leipzig.** For the series in Botany, Geology, Pathology, Physiology, and also American Archaeology and Ethnology, **R. Friedlaender & Sohn, Berlin.**